

5729

THE

*Seven's  
Do. of Mr. Johnson  
Paul's  
Church*

SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY OF CHRIST:

OR,

A Demonstration from the Sacred Books, that JESUS CHRIST, in his *complete* Person, is *truly*, and properly the *begotten* Son, of the *only* LIVING and TRUE God:

BEING

An Answer to the Rev. Mr. Romaine's celebrated Sermon, intituled, "The *Self-existence* of Jesus Christ."

In a LETTER to the Author.

---

By R. ELLIOT, A. B. *h*  
Formerly of Bennet College, Cambridge.

---

Say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God? John x. 36.  
Straitway he preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God, Acts ix. 20.  
Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God, 1 John iv. 15.

---

L O N D O N :

Printed for the AUTHOR : And Sold by J. JOHNSON, No. 71.  
St. Paul's Church-yard.  
M.DCC.LXXV.

Where may be had, by the same Author, Divine Revelation the only Test, &c. 4s. — Scripture Sufficiency, 6d. — and Sacred Controversy, 6d.

[ Price One Shilling. ]





# P R E F A C E

T O T H E

CANDID AND CHRISTIAN READER.

**T**HAT great and good men may err, by whose influence others also are very apt to err with them, may be clearly seen in the conduct of Peter at Antioch, where, fearing those of the circumcision, he declined from the truth, and dissembled his real sentiments; insomuch that many others, and even Barnabas himself, having the sanction of so great a name, followed him in his error, and dissembled likewise.—“The fear of man bringeth a snare.”—But though Peter was so eminent an apostle, a pillar of the church, yet when his brother Paul observed, that he walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, he withstood him to the face, and reproved him publicly.—“God accepteth no man’s person.”—Now the matter in dispute between us and our opponents, so far as it respects the person of Christ, is, I think, only this, viz. *whether* JESUS CHRIST, *in his complete person, be the true Son of the* LIVING God: we say he is, our opposers say he is not. This is the sum of the controversy, it intirely hinges on this single point. The most plausible and popular argument of the Athanasians seems to be this: “Like begets like; every Being, that is begotten among the creatures, is of the same nature with him that begat him.” Hence they reason after this manner: “If Christ be truly the begotten

Son of God, he must be of the same nature with God, and consequently is God." As this argument is intirely built on the nature of generation among the creatures, and is not at all supported from scripture, but only from reasoning, by way of analogy : upon the very same ground, and by the same authority, it may be further argued, thus : *As that which is begotten is of the same essence with that which begets, so he that is begotten is another Being distinct from him that begat him : for when a man begets a person of his own nature, he begets a man like himself ; and the person begotten is not the same Being with him that begat, but another man, wholly distinct from him. If then it be right, and proper, in this case, to argue from the creature to the Creator, it plainly follows, that as man begets, of his own nature, another perfect man ; so God begets of his own nature, another perfect God : and the person so begotten of God, is no more the same God with him that begat, because begotten of his essence ; than a human person begotten of man, is the same man with him that begat, because begotten of his essence : ; so that this way of proving Christ's deity from supposing him to be of the same essence or nature with him that begat him, will equally prove him, not to be that God who begat him, but another God, viz. a begotten God. Neither is that substance whereof a person is made, or begotten, a real person, or an intelligent Being, before he is made, or begotten. Eve was not a woman before she was made such by the great Creator,*

tho' the rib from whence she was formed, was before a part of Adam's substance. It is not said, God took a *woman* out of man, but he took a *rib* from the man, *and made it a woman*: "Adam was first formed, then Eve." Neither was Cain a *real* man before he was begotten of his Father Adam, altho' the substance whereof he was begotten, had a prior existence in the loins of his father; therefore it by no means follows, because a person is begotten of his father's substance, that he is therefore *co-eval*, or *co-equal* with him. And should it be admitted (tho' the scripture saith not one word about it) that the Son of God was begotten of his Father's substance; yet it would no more prove him to be the *very same Being*, or the *same God* with his Father; than Cain's being begotten of the substance of his Father Adam, would prove him to be the *very same Being*, or *man*, with *his* father. I do not pretend to determine *how*, or of *what substance* Christ was begotten; this only I maintain, that Christ is the true and begotten Son of God, and that he is not that God who begat him, both which, tho' a palpable contradiction, are unaccountably maintained by the Athanasians. The Hutchinsonians therefore have justly exploded the common notion of Christ's generation, as a divine person, or as the true God; for they rightly maintain, that the TRUE GOD is *self-existent*, and in no sense whatever is properly generated, or begotten: but then, on the other hand, they have run into another extreme, far more dangerous than that of the Athanasians; for whereas the Athanasians



narians rightly believe, and affirm, that Christ is personally, and properly the Son of God ; and have only drawn wrong inferences from right premises, which may easily be remedied : the Hutchinsonians, on the contrary, deny that Jesus Christ is the true and *real* Son of the living God. They say indeed that Christ, *as a divine person*, is a SON *by office* : but who told them so, I know not : for certain it is, the scripture hath nowhere declared it. A *begotten* son, or an *adopted* son, is both rational, and scriptural ; we know what the terms mean : but an *official* son sounds *barbarous*, and seems to have no meaning in it. That Christ should be called GOD, or the WORD, *officially*, is both agreeable to reason and revelation ; for Jehovah said to Moses, *I have made thee a God* unto Pharaoh : and we know also that the TRUE GOD hath spoken unto us *by* his Son : but neither reason nor scripture will warrant us to say that Christ is a SON *by office*. Some persons indeed have borne the name of son *typically*, but never *officially* ; and the reason why the name was given them typically, is plainly this ; because there was a *real* Son of GOD, whom those persons typified ; see 2 Sam. vii. 14. Hos. xi. 1. compared with Matt. ii. 15. To deny therefore that Jesus is the true Son of God, is, in my opinion, a *real heresy*, and fatal in its consequences ; and it matters not whatever else any person believes concerning Christ ; for unless he believe on him as the truly begotten, and anointed Son of God, his faith will profit him nothing : as then  
 this

this capital error of denying Christ to be the Son of God seems to spread greatly in our day, and is propagated by the means of some great names, and popular preachers, among whom I reckon Mr. Romaine to be the chief; and as I find also that his sermon, intitled *The Self-existence of Jesus Christ*, is generally supposed to contain unanswerable arguments in support of his opinion; I judged it to be both seasonable and necessary to attempt the refutation of so great an error, and that by writing and publishing a plain and full answer to *that Sermon* \*. Should any one suppose that this letter is the effect of envy or malevolence, he does me wrong—"Charity thinketh no evil."—Mr. Wallin, in his discourse on the Sonship of Christ, hath already endeavoured to give a check to this dangerous error; but as he *seems* to have opposed it upon the old Athanasian plan, it is nothing strange that the Hutchinsonian cause should not be sensibly affected by it; especially as he asserts,—"*that* Christ is the *natural*, and *proper* Son of the Father, does not infer that he is *produced* into being; much less that he *derives* his essence from the Father: neither doth it connote any *priority*, or *inferiority* in nature, or in *point of existence* and glory." Doth not this author then evidently contradict himself, and determine the point in favour of the Hutchinsonians? Just as Dr. Gill had done before him; wherein also they most certainly have opposed all the *antients*, who were reputed *orthodox* in the article of the Tri-

\* Note, All the Quotations are taken from the first edition.

nity \* ; and not them only, but the scripture likewise, which testifies that the Son hath *life in himself, by gift*, from the Father ; and that he liveth *by* the Father, John v. 26. ch. vi. 57. We for our part, believe, and maintain, from the testimony of the divine word, that the TRUE GOD is *self-existent* and not begotten ; and that the TRUE SON of God, *Jesus Christ*, is not *self-existent*, but *begotten* : for what can be plainer than this, that a person who is self-existent cannot be a begotten Son ; and that a person who is a begotten Son, cannot be self-existent ? But should any one still suppose, as some have ignorantly done, that our doctrine is that of Sabellius, Arius, or Socinus, I shall only say, I will engage to prove, if it hath not been fully done already, that our doctrine is the doctrine of the bible, according to the plain and certain sense of scripture ; and I hope that no christian will presume to say, or even imagine, that the holy prophets and apostles were all, or any of them *Arians*. If *they* were not, neither are *we* ; but if *they* were *Arians*, I desire to be one of the *same sort* : and I can wish thee, christian reader, no greater good, no diviner blessing, than that thou mayest be, both in faith and practice, such as the apostles ; and that thy latter end may be like theirs.

I am thine to serve, for Jesus' sake,

R. E.

\* See Divine Revelation, p. 6—13.

---

E R R A T A.

P. 22. l. 7. for " him," read *himself*.

P. 74. l. 42. begin the line with *from*.



A

## L E T T E R, &amp;c.

REV. SIR,

**I**N your discourse, intitled, *The Self-existence of JESUS CHRIST*, you have directed and advised your readers “to consult the sacred books upon it,” and have even intreated them “to examine the matter strictly and solemnly.” Agreeable, therefore, to this wholesome advice, and the pressing exhortation which you have there given us; I have taken the pains to search the scripture on that head, examining and trying your doctrine by it: but after making a fair and thorough trial, duly considering your doctrine of the Trinity, and of the person of Christ; and carefully weighing it in the balances of the sanctuary, I find it to be greatly wanting, and have even ventured to write TEKEL upon it. The examination, with my reasons for rejecting your doctrine, are briefly declared in the following sheets; which I

A

hope

hope you will hear, or read with due attention, and temper. And whereas the scripture is the allowed test, and touchstone of divine truth, you cannot I think be offended with me for trying *your* doctrine by it; especially as you yourself have bid me do it: neither can any of your *christian* friends be displeased with me for so doing, without being displeased with you also for *advising* me to it, unless they respect persons, and judge unrighteous judgment: but rather the godly and upright among them, who may have ignorantly received error for truth, through a culpable neglect of comparing your doctrine with the sacred books, though you yourself had advised them to it, will be glad to be undeceived, in so capital an error, and will thankfully reap the fruit of other men's labours; so that instead of being reproached, I shall rather be commended by them. From furious bigots indeed, and unconverted zealots (for there are few popular assemblies without them) I expect to meet with insult and abuse; these perhaps will say to me, as Ahab once did to Elijah, "Art thou he that troubleth Israel?" But if I have faithfully quoted your words, without misrepresenting your meaning; compared your doctrine with the scriptures, without perverting them; argued fairly, and with proper temper; you yourself must clear me from every such charge, because I have only done that which the scripture warrants, and which you yourself have exhorted me to do.

THAT *your* doctrine of the Trinity in general, and of the person of Christ in particular, widely differs from *that* described in the *Nicene* and *Athanasian* creeds, is sufficiently clear

clear and manifest ; for they have taught us to believe that there is but *one self-existent person*, whereas you tell us there are *three* : and of the two systems I greatly prefer theirs to yours : for however inconsistent they may be with themselves, yet they constantly hold and maintain that *Christ*, in his *whole person*, is *truly* and *properly* the Son of God ; whereas you, in my opinion, plainly deny it : and since you have taken the liberty to differ from *them*, is it strange that another person should take the liberty, in some particulars, to differ from you both ?

BUT although we equally reject the notion of a *derived Deity*, or of a *divine person being begotten*, which is the common doctrine both of *papists* and *protestants*, even as they have received it by *tradition* from their fathers, and which by long *custom* is now become their established creed ; yet your opinion and mine very widely differ. Let us then reconsider our respective sentiments, and examine them both by the divine word ; and thus endeavour to find out where the mistake lies. You have already declared your opinion, together with your reasons in support of it ; which also I have carefully read, and seriously considered : nor have I designedly passed over any of your arguments on which you seem to lay the greatest stress, but have given every one of them their full force and scope. And now I beg leave to shew mine opinion also ; hoping that you will hear me patiently, and deal with me as I have dealt with you. I beseech you then, my dear Sir, to give this letter a serious and attentive reading : you will not, I hope, treat it, as the proud in spirit who can brook no opposition ; or as the patrons of error, and workers of iniquity,



who cannot endure the light : were I writing to such, I should not marvel, if they *refused to read a line of it* ; and only answered it by a sullen silence, or with *silent contempt* : but from Mr. Romaine I hope better things, and expect to receive a very different treatment : “ for the servant of the Lord must be gentle unto all men, apt to teach—in meekness instructing them that oppose themselves ”—moreover, as you have directed us to examine your doctrine by the bible, how unreasonable must it appear in the eyes of every considerate man, should you refuse to read one line of the examination : for to what purpose do preachers and authors appeal to any test, if, after all, they mean not to have their opinions and doctrines tried by it ? and of what use can the trial be, if they themselves refuse to read, or hear a word of it, and endeavour to hinder others from doing it likewise ? Might not such men as reasonably forbid the examination itself ? But although some of your mistaken friends may think and say hard things of me, because I have ventured to make remarks on your sermon, yet Mr. Romaine cannot, on that account, reckon me *a disturber of the church’s peace*, or a troubler of Israel ; seeing you yourself have both exhorted, and advised me to it : for I dare not rank you among the number of those preachers who direct the hearers to try their sermons by the scripture, and afterwards abuse and censure them for it \*. But after all, it is examination

\* Mr. M’Gowan supposes such ministers to be emissaries of satan, and in league with hell. “ It is merry enough (saith he) to hear them exhort their hearers to search the scriptures, to try the spirits, to take heed what they hear—and yet after all, if any one of the hearers attempts to bring the parson’s

tion and trial only, that makes all things manifest: for as the integrity of that man who declines a fair trial is violently, and justly suspected; so the truth of that doctrine which will not bear to be examined is justly to be doubted, and called in question. Besides, are you not a christian minister? and is not Christ your master? and would you not take him for your pattern? I am persuaded that you desire to do it in all things: did Christ then ever refuse to hear what his opposers had to say against him? did he not vouchsafe an answer even to the cavilling Pharisees, and to infidel Sadducees? but if the servant refuse to do that, which his Lord never refused? to what shall we impute it? Is the servant greater than his Lord? Certainly not. To what then shall we impute it? to inability? or contempt? I hope not the latter, for Christ despised not any: and no man that knows Mr. Romaine will question his ability to defend one of the most plain and capital doctrines of the bible. Neither is my manner of arguing and treating the subject, captious or evasive, artful or ensnaring: for the truth of this I dare appeal to the conscience of every unprejudiced and considerate man, who shall give himself the trouble to read this letter with due attention and seriousness; for I have studied thro' the whole to be honestly plain and open, both in declaring your opinion and my own, and in comparing them both with the sacred books; regarding, and reverencing the  
divine

son's own sermon to trial by the scripture, he is deemed a troublesome, self-conceited fellow; and if he happens to disprove his doctrine by the scripture, he is presently dealt with, and excommunicated as a troubler of Israel: for the parson would have other people's doctrines tried, and if false refuted, but it is impious to do so by his own." Dialogues, vol. i. p. 108.

divine word above all ; being as ready to oppose myself, and retract my own sentiments, the moment they shall appear not to be right, according to the scriptures ; as to oppose, and persuade others to renounce their sentiments, because I think them to be wrong, and contrary to the scriptures.—I declare solemnly before God, that if the error is with us, and the truth with you, it is my earnest desire to be convinced of it, and to renounce the error and embrace the truth : all I want, and all I ask is, that you will prove your doctrine to be of God, by scripture evidence, plain, and full ; but hitherto you have not done it : and whereas I think that you are not able to do this, because in my opinion your doctrine is not contained in the bible, therefore I have attempted to point out your mistake, and by many express scripture texts, and by fair reasoning from thence I have endeavoured also to convince you of it.—If then you return me no answer, it is highly probable that some persons will impute your silence to nothing else but want of scripture evidence, and consequently will conclude that your doctrine is not of God : and for my own part, I am inclined to believe, that as nothing else ought ; so nothing else will prevent you, both from reading, and answering this letter—to provoke unto love, and to good works, is to imitate the apostles : — you have every advantage on your side ; for you greatly exceed in numbers, wealth, and ability. We pretend to nothing but having obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful ; being persuaded also, that the plain sense, as well as the express testimony of the sacred books is in our favour.—You are my elder in years, my superior in learning ; and, as one that is set for the defence of the gospel,



gospel, ought you not to write, as well as preach in the defence of it? Draw then, my dear Sir, the sword of the Spirit; not the sword of the civil magistrate, leave that to the rulers of the darkness of this world: but the sword of the Spirit is the christian's weapon, use it skilfully and spare not—"henceforth know we no man after the flesh"—you will do me a kindness to wound me with it, if I at all resist the truth, or have in any instance departed from it. God, who knows your heart and mine, is witness, that I am not in the least conscious of either, for I know that I have all along, from the beginning, acted from principle, as in his sight; and am still persuaded in my own soul, that what I am now contending for, is the true doctrine, and sense of scripture; and if you think otherwise, will you not take some pains to convince a friend, and reclaim him from his supposed error, who at least means well, and thinks that the doctrine he is contending for, is the true doctrine of God.

As to what Messieurs Weir and Shrubsole have written against me, I am persuaded that you yourself will not allow them any considerable merit. Let men divested of prejudice, men of discernment and candour, judge between us. I have hoped, long ago, that some able advocate for the Trinitarian cause would have appeared on its behalf, if their cause be good; one that was able to treat the subject with understanding and judgment; who by scripture testimony plain and apposite, and by just reasoning, clear and conclusive, might determine the point in dispute betwixt us: and may I not hope for this from Mr. Romaine? who more capable? who more proper?

I have

I have said before, and say again, if this be not attempted, we shall be apt to conclude that our doctrine is certainly scriptural, and of God : and that yours is not ; and that for this cause only, it will not come to the light, because it cannot endure a faithful, and severe scrutiny : “ for he that doth truth, cometh to the light.”—I am well assured, whatever some weak and prejudiced minds may imagine or suggest to the contrary, that our doctrine concerning God, and his Christ ; is a safe, a useful, and a comfortable doctrine : it is a doctrine which a man may both live and die by, and that with his eyes open ; but with regard to the *trinitarian* hypothesis, especially the *Hutchinsonian*, I am persuaded that no man can live and die by it, unless with his eyes shut : for, in my humble opinion, it hath not one single *express* scripture for its support. But my friend Mr. Romaine thinks otherwise, and therefore hath honestly referred us to the divine records for the truth of his doctrine ; for to them he hath appealed in the following words :

“ LET us then consult the sacred books upon it, and hear their judgment, and abide by their determination.”  
P. 7.

THIS sentence is according to my wish ; it contains excellent counsel, expresses my very sentiments, and I heartily concur with it. Seeing then we both agree to consult the scripture upon the point ; and to abide by the judgment of the inspired writers : let us proceed to search the sacred books, and these shall decide the matter between us. I, for my part, am resolved to acquiesce

in

in their judgment, and to abide by their determination. And I hope Mr. Romaine, who hath made the proposal and recommended it, will not himself decline the scrutiny, nor recede from it. This preliminary then being agreed to, signed, and settled, and that in the presence of many witnesses; if the terms be religiously observed, on both sides, it is more than probable that as honest men, and christians, we shall come to a better agreement, and perhaps, at last, be of the same judgment concerning this matter.

THEY certainly take too much upon them, who assume to themselves a power of framing and imposing articles of a religious nature upon their brethren, which God hath not given them, nor revealed, nor commanded in his word: for who but God only hath a right to command, and bind the conscience? But this papal usurpation, and tyranny over the souls of men, Mr. Romaine abhors and utterly disclaims; for he hath bid us to try even his own doctrine by the sacred books. Now, in the above sentence, if I mistake not, are evidently contained the following particulars: *first*, it declares, that it is both our *duty* and *privilege* to examine for ourselves, and to try the religious opinions, and doctrines of men, by the holy scriptures; and not to receive any one of them as divinely true, save those only which evidently correspond, and accord with that infallible test:—"prove all things, hold fast that which is good"—*secondly*, it declares that the sacred writings do so fully reveal, and clearly express *every great, and essential article of the christian faith*; that all persons whatsoever, who seriously read, and search the scriptures,



tures, may easily understand, and readily apprehend them : and *lastly*, it supposes, that Mr. Romaine himself did imagine and sincerely believe, that his doctrine was plainly revealed, and delivered in the holy scriptures ; and therefore he was desirous of having it examined, and tried by them : thus, “ every one that doth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God.”

Now the first argument that Mr. Romaine hath brought in support of his doctrine, and which I shall here examine, is contained in the following words—“ None can deliver you from sin, but he who came to take away the sins of the world ; and he cannot deliver you *as man*, he must be GOD who can have *merit* sufficient to take away sin.” p. 6.

ANS. I. To the former part of this sentence, I object nothing, but gladly concur with it ; only I observe, that he who came, and was also sent to take away the sins of the world, was the *Lamb of God*, John i. 29. but the Lamb of God, was not God himself, but his Son, who gave himself a sacrifice unto God for us. Will any *bible* christian deny this ?—To the latter part I object : and as you have directed us to consult the sacred books, we are resolved, through grace, to do it ; therefore we will now begin to try your doctrine by them.

“ CHRIST,” saith Mr. Romaine, “ cannot deliver us as man.” But what saith St. Paul ? “ Since *by man* came death, *by man* came also the resurrection of the dead,” 1 Cor. xv. 21. Now if deliverance from death came by  
man,

man, then it plainly follows, that deliverance from sin, the cause of death, must come by man also ; for the effect cannot be destroyed, unless the cause producing that effect be first taken away. No physician can restore health to his patient, without first removing the cause of his disorder. Now death is the effect whereof sin is the cause, “ the wages of sin is death ” — “ by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin : ” but here the apostle plainly tells us, that death, which is the punishment, and effect of sin, was destroyed *by man* ; therefore from the scripture it appears, that Mr. Romaine is mistaken.

AGAIN ; we are told, that “ the Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many,” Matt. xx. 28. Now Christ could not speak this of himself, as God ; for it cannot be said that God, the TRUE GOD, gave his life a ransom ; not only because God cannot suffer, but because also the offering, or ransom was given unto God : so that the above text must needs mean that Christ, *as man*, gave himself a ransom ; and this also the Holy Ghost hath plainly declared to us, even by the mouth of Caiaphas, when to the Jews he said, “ it is expedient for us that *one man* die for the people,” John xi. 50. But the apostle Paul hath settled this matter beyond all possibility of doubt, for speaking of the very same subject, he testifies, that the “ one Mediator between God and men, who gave himself a ransom for all, is *the man Christ Jesus*,” 1 Tim. ii. 5. it is therefore undeniably plain, that by the Son of man in Matt. xx. 28. is meant the *man Christ Jesus*, who, as is declared in another scripture, “ gave himself for us, an offering, and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling favour,”

your," Eph. v. 2. therefore from the scripture it appears, that Christ, *as man*, both could and did deliver us.

You tell us indeed, "he must be God, who can have *merit* sufficient to take away sin." This is your reason; a bare assertion, without any proof,—but as you have not produced one single text from the scriptures to prove it, and I have produced many to prove the contrary, and you yourself have agreed to abide by their determination; it plainly follows that our doctrine is the doctrine of scripture, and that yours is not—nor can you fairly deny it. Permit me, dear Sir, to ask you one or two plain questions. Could the MOST HIGH GOD in any *proper* sense suffer and die? And did not Christ *merit* deliverance for his people, by *real sufferings* and death? A direct answer to these plain questions would bring the point to a short issue. It is too plain to be denied, that the scripture constantly ascribes the *merit* of our deliverance from sin, and wrath, to the sufferings and death of Christ, and to that only: "we were reconciled to God by the *death* of his Son," Rom. v. 10.—"Thou hast redeemed us to God by thy *blood*," Rev. v. 9 "Christ hath once *suffered* for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God," 1 Pet. iii. 18. &c. &c. and I challenge Mr. Romaine to produce one single text, where it is said, that Christ obeyed, or suffered, or merited *as God*, or *as God-man*; but the scripture plainly declares, as hath been already shewn, that Christ suffered as man: See likewise Isaiah liii. throughout. Christ indeed was a man of God's providing, called "the man of his right hand, the Son of man whom he made strong for himself," Ps. lxxx. 17.

And



And will any one presume to say that the *man* whom God anointed, and sent into the world to save sinners, could not deliver us from sin and wrath? in other words, that God himself could not deliver, and save his people *by* the man Christ Jesus? was there not sufficient *merit* in the offering which God provided, to answer the end for which he provided it? Who that believes the living God to be all-wise, and almighty will deny this? It is likewise clear and certain, that in all penal obligations, and in all cases of debt, it is the *actual suffering* of the penalty, or the *payment* of the debt, that procures a legal discharge, and *merits* deliverance, and no other circumstance whatever. Now sins are debts whereby the sinner is fallen under the curse of God's law, and is become subject to death, from which penalty he can only be delivered by sufferings and death; "for without shedding of blood there is no remission," therefore he must needs have suffered: I infer then, that the person which suffered *merited*, in the very same nature which suffered, *and in that alone*: and since Christ did not, nor could suffer as God, but only as man; it plainly follows that his sufferings, *as man*, have *merit* sufficient to take away sin; and of this "God hath given unto all men the fullest assurance, in that he hath raised him from the dead," Acts xvii. 31.

ARG. 2. "The divinity of Jesus Christ is the very foundation of the christian religion: it is the first and principal article; the whole rests upon it; even what is called the morality of the gospel receives its obligation from his being the true God." p. 7.

ANS.

Ans. 2. Mr. Romaine, I conceive, is intirely mistaken, for the scripture will not at all support him, in what he here asserts: the divinity of Christ, by which Mr. Romaine means, his *personal self-existence*, is so far from being the foundation of the christian religion; that on the contrary, it would thereby be wholly subverted, and overthrown: and I may venture to affirm, that Mr. Romaine himself never did, nor can preach the gospel, without denying that very doctrine, on which, he here tells us, the whole of the christian religion is founded: for if Christ be himself the true God, where will Mr. Romaine find a priest to offer sacrifice, and minister unto *that* God for him? and who then is the Mediator that must stand between us and God? he is no-where to be found: but where there is no *officiating priest*, and *mediator* to stand between us and God, there is no true gospel: and for any one to say that Christ is himself the true God, and also the true mediator between God and men, is a self-contradiction, and a glaring absurdity: for as a *mediator* cannot be either of the parties between whom he mediates; it clearly follows, that when any man affirms of Christ, that he is the true God; he thereby denies him to be the mediator between God and men: and when on the other hand he affirms of Christ, that *he* is the mediator between God and men; he thereby denies him to be the true God. 2. “It is not the first and principal article of the christian religion:” for the first article of the christian faith, according to our rule, that is, as the scripture teacheth us, is to believe that Jesus is the *Christ*, the *Son* of the living God, Matt. xvi. 16. Acts viii. 37. and ch. ix. 20. So the apostles preached, and so the most ancient christians believed: and I desire Mr. Romaine to produce

duce one single text, if he be able, where the apostles have either preached Christ, *as the true God*, or required any one to believe on him, *as such*; or where the converts to the christian faith did ever confess him to be their God: but if he cannot do this, then our doctrine concerning Christ, and our faith in him, *as the Son of God*, is according to the faith once delivered to the saints, as the apostles preached, and as the first christians believed: that Thomas's confession, John xx. 28. hath no such meaning, is certain from the 17th and 31st verses of the same chapter; which also is more abundantly manifest from the apostles preaching, and writings after the day of pentecost. 3. The morality of the gospel doth not receive its obligation from Christ's being the true God; for Christ with his own mouth hath in the plainest and fullest manner declared, that he spake nothing of himself, but as he had received a commandment from the Father. See John xii. 49, 50. ch. xvii. 6, 7, 8. "Jesus therefore cried, and said, He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me," John xii. 44. As then the words which Christ spake were not his own, but the Father's; and as the faith of them that truly believed on him, did not terminate in Christ's own person, but on God the Father who sent him: it is clear and certain, that the *morality* of the gospel doth not receive its obligation from Christ's being the true God; but from his being sent of the true God, and from the true God's speaking *in* him and *by* him: and this is what Jehovah, the living God, had before declared by the mouth of Moses, Deut. xviii. 15, 19. But is it not astonishing that Mr. Romaine, who hath referred us to the scripture for the divinity of his doctrine, hath not brought one single

3

text,



text, from all the sacred books, in confirmation of his doctrine, though his opinion be so new and strange to the christian world ; but perhaps he may refer us to some by-and-by ; let us therefore attend to his third argument.

ARG. 3. " The christian church has always acknowledged Jesus Christ to be God, *co-equal* and *co-eternal* with the Father, and has offered prayers and praises unto him, and served him with every act of religious worship." p. 7.

ANS. 3. John v. 23. is the only scripture Mr. Romaine hath here cited in support of his doctrine ; but that text hath no such meaning, and therefore he had better have omitted it : for the honour which Christ there speaks of is evidently founded on that office and dignity to which the Father hath exalted him as judge of the world ; and therefore cannot respect him as a divine person, or as the true God, but as man only : even Mr. M'gowan, tho' himself a trinitarian, plainly understands it in this sense—  
 " The Son of God (saith he) *was appointed lord lieutenant of the creation—was predestinated, at a time appointed, to assume a nature inferior to that of angels ; and the MOST HIGH commanded that in that nature all the angels of God should worship the Son, even as they worship the Father, and that all should submit to the government of THE MAN whom God delighteth to honour.*"—" Nothing (he further adds) grieves the heart of old satan so much as this, *the very man* whose exaltation he opposed, whose sway he resisted, and whose person he hath still in the most perfect abhorrence, is dignified, not only by a personal union with Jehovah, but by *all judgment being committed into his*  
 " hand."

*hands.*" If by the christian church Mr. Romaine includes those churches that existed in the days of the apostles, he ought to have proved his assertions from their writings, but nothing of this appears; and the reason why he did not so much as attempt it, is very plain, because the apostles never acknowledged, nor taught any such doctrine: they knew of no *co-equals* in DEITY, and therefore they have not so much as once mentioned any such thing: they often indeed speak of the one living and true God, and him they always call the Father: and they as constantly declare Jesus Christ to be his Son; but they at no time offered prayers and praises to Christ, *as God*; there is not a single instance of it in all the scripture: and since the time that pope Julius protected and espoused the cause of Athanasius, there have not been wanting christian men who have maintained the truth against the trinitarian error, though in the western churches their numbers have been comparatively small, being constrained, as the scripture speaks, to "*prophecy in sackcloth,*" because of the oppression of papal usurpation and cruelty: but if some writers are to be credited, the numbers of *unitarians* in the *east* are even greater than those of the *trinitarians* in the *west*. But be that as it may; we have both agreed to refer this matter to the judgment of the sacred books: therefore let us again consult our infallible rule.

AND, *First*, Christ himself hath expressly testified that his Father is the *only true God*; to him, as such, he prayed, and gave thanks, &c. which I prove from the following scriptures: "This is life eternal, to know *thee the only true God*, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent," John

xvii. 3. and again, "It is my Father that honoureth me, of whom ye say that he is your God," John viii. 54.—He gives thanks to him, "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth," Matt. xi. 25. and again, "Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me," John xi. 41.—He prays to him, "Father, save me from this hour," John xii. 27.—"Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee," Mark xiv. 36.—He served him, and offered sacrifice to him—"As the Father gave me commandment, even so I do," John xiv. 31. "He gave himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God," Eph. v. 2. Heb. ix. 14.—Lastly, he calls the Father his God: "I delight to do thy will, O my God," Ps. xl. 8—"My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me!" Matt. xxvii. 46. And after his resurrection he sent this message to his disciples, "Go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God," John xx. 17. and the apostles constantly did as he bad them, and as Christ himself had set them an example; for they always called upon, and worshipped the Father of Christ, as their God: so Paul, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," &c. Eph. i. 3. and in ver. 17. he prays "that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the Spirit of wisdom," &c. And again, "I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," ch. iii. 14. I might have cited a great many other texts, equally clear and express to our purpose, but these surely are enough to satisfy every unprejudiced mind, that regards the word of God, more than the word of man; and if these scriptures do not disprove what Mr. Romaine hath here asserted, there  
can



can be no certain meaning in words or sentences: but should any one imagine that some person, who is not the Father, is as plainly and expressly declared in other scriptures, to be the true God, and that he was worshipped, as such, by the apostles: I answer, It is *only imagination*, for sure I am there is no such thing to be found in all their writings: besides, he, who supposes that the doctrine which is plainly declared and testified in one part of scripture, is in another part of scripture, as plainly denied and contradicted; sets the sacred writers at variance, and makes the word of God of no effect: “for if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?” and if words and sentences do not signify, and convey to our minds a certain sense and meaning, how shall it be known what is spoken? or of what use are they to us?

2. THOUGH the name *God* be given to other beings, besides the true God; as it often is both to men and angels: see Exod. vii. 1. Ps. lxxxii. 1. John x. 34. Ps. xcvi. 7. 1 Cor. viii. 5. yet I assert, that the scripture never calls any one the *true God*, or the *living God*, but the Father only; and that in plain distinction from the Son, as well as in direct opposition to all idols or false gods—“The true worshippers, saith Christ, shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth, for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a Spirit; and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth,” John iv. 23, 24. “Ye turned to God from idols, to serve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven,” 1 Thess. i. 9. “To us there is but one God the Father,”

Father," 1 Cor. viii. 6. Now the Father, who is expressly declared to be the true God, is not three persons, but one only. To affirm then of any other person, that he also is the true God, is plainly to make more Gods than one:—*co-equal Gods*, as well as *co-equal persons*—but the scripture authorizes no such doctrine; it is the invention and doctrine of men.—*God the Father* is very common in scripture; and *the God and Father* of Jesus Christ is likewise common: but *God the Son*, or *God the Spirit*, never once occurs in all the bible: whence then did Mr. Romaine and other trinitarians learn their creed? and who taught them to speak in this manner? *Doth not scripture phrase best express scripture meaning?* Dare we correct the inspired writers! If we *invert their words*, and alter their terms, are we not likely to *pervert their meaning*, and alter their sense likewise? If the phrases *Son of God*, and *God the Son*:—*Spirit of God*, and *God the Spirit*, are terms synonymous, and mean exactly the same thing; how is it that the scripture always makes use of the one, and never of the other?—But to proceed, Mr. Romaine tells us,

ARG. 4. "If he (viz. Christ) was in *any respect inferior* to the Father, christianity would be altogether the most stupid and absurd system of religion, and the most gross piece of idolatry that was ever invented in the world,"  
p. 7.

ANS. 4. I hope these words were spoken in haste, and hurried to the press without due consideration; and was I writing against some persons, I would not scruple to say, that the whole sentence is full of blasphemy, daringly prophane,

prophane, and impious : no infidel in Britain would desire more than Mr. Romaine hath here granted, in order to prove that christianity is worse than paganism, the vilest system of priestcraft that was ever invented by men, equally weak and wicked. Who that reads and believes the scriptures but must clearly see, and know that Christ, in *some respect*, is inferior to the Father ? The Athanasian trinitarians themselves do most of them allow it, therefore, in this particular, they also must dissent from you : but let us consult your own rule, and hear what the sacred books have said of this matter.

1. LET us attend to what the apostle Peter saith concerning it : “ Ye men of Israel (saith Peter) hear these words ; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles, and wonders, and signs which God did *by him*,” Acts ii. 22. And in another place he saith, “ God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil ; *for God was with him*,” ch. x. 38. “ Wherefore he saith again, Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ,” Acts ii. 36. This then is Peter’s testimony both to Jews and Gentiles ; wherein he plainly declares that Jesus, our Saviour, received the Holy Ghost from God the Father ; and that the miracles which Jesus wrought, God did them *by him*, and that God the Father hath made this same Jesus both Lord and Christ : if then Peter’s testimony be true, it is certain that Christ, in some respect, is inferior to God.



2. LET us hear what Paul saith of the matter : " GOD (saith that apostle) *hath raised* to Israel a *Saviour* JESUS," Acts xiii. 23. " and hath given him to be head over all things to the church," Eph. i. 22. for he again testifies, " the head of every man is Christ, and the head of Christ is God," 1 Cor. xi. 3. Now *he* that is the *head* of *another* is certainly above him whose head he is ; and he that raises up another to be a Saviour, and makes him Lord of all, as God the Father hath made his Christ, doth certainly bless him ; but " without all contradiction the *less* is blessed of the *better* : " therefore it is further manifest from Paul's testimony, that Christ is *inferior* to the Father : and if the apostle was a judge of right reasoning and argument, he concludes it to be a case indisputably clear, and undeniably true. Nor do the apostles give us the least intimation of any *nature* or subsistence in Christ, that was *equal* to God the Father, and not inferior to him ; they never make any such exception : but they evidently speak of his *whole person*, and testify that God hath raised up Jesus, *as Jesus* ; and that God is the head of Christ, *as Christ* ; and hath exalted him to be a prince and a saviour in his complete person : and therefore, as the Psalmist declares, " God hath blessed him for ever," Ps. xlv. 2.

3. LET us hear what Christ himself saith concerning this matter : " All things (saith he) are delivered unto me of my Father," Matt. xi. 27. " For my Father is greater than I," John xiv. 28. Therefore if Christ knew himself and his Father, it is most certain and true, that in *some respect* he is *inferior* to the Father ; except Mr. Romaine will venture to affirm that he who is *greater* than another,

another, is in *no respect* superior to him ; and he that is *less* than another is in *no respect* inferior to him ; but that greater and less, superior and inferior, are words and terms that mean exactly the same thing : but as I cannot suppose Mr. Romaine will say this ; it plainly follows both from the testimony of the apostles, and of Christ himself, that the Father is greater than he ; and that Christ, in some respect, is inferior to him : but is it not strange and unaccountable that Mr. Romaine, who hath bid his reader to consult the sacred books for the truth of his doctrine, should not cite, nor at all refer us to any one scripture, in support of what he here asserts, unless he intended John v. 23 as a proof of it ; but that text, as we have shewn already, is quite against him ; so that we have nothing but his bare word for the truth of his doctrine ; and were it not that he exhorts us to consult the scriptures, and agrees to abide by their determination ; the reader would be almost tempted to think, that he was either unacquainted with them, or else in his heart disbelieved them. But it is so far from being true that Christ is in *no respect* inferior to God the Father, that it is clear and certain from the sacred writings, that he is in *all respects* inferior to him : what else mean these scriptures, “ Be not thou far from me, O Jehovah ; O my strength, haste thee to help me,” Ps. xxii. 19. “ He shall cry unto me, Thou art my Father, my God, and the rock of my salvation,” Psalm lxxxix. 26, “ Because he hath set his love upon me, therefore will I deliver him ; I will set him on high, because he hath known my name,” Ps. xci. 14. “ Behold my servant, whom I uphold, mine elect in whom my soul delighteth : I have put my Spirit upon him—he shall not fail

fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth," Isa. xlii. 1, 4. "The Lord God will help me, *therefore* shall I not be confounded; *therefore* have I set my face like a flint, and I know that I shall not be ashamed," ch. l. 7. "Verily, verily I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do,"—"I can of mine own self do nothing," John v. 19, 30. "Jesus knew that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God, and went to God," ch. xiii. 3. "Now they have known that *all things whatsoever* thou hast given me are of thee," ch. xvii. 7. "He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God, for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him. The Father loveth the Son, and hath *given all things* into his hand," ch. iii. 34, 35. "I have power to lay down my life, and have power to take it again; this commandment have I received of my Father," ch. x. 18. "Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father," Rom. vi. 4. "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a prince and a saviour," Acts v. 31. "All power is given unto me both in heaven and in earth," Matt. xxviii. 18. "The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him," Rev. i. 1. Can words be more express than these? Can a testimony be more full? Do they not declare in the most clear and ample manner, that Christ is in all things inferior to God the Father? Therefore the meaning of the above sentence, which we have cited from Mr. Romaine's sermon, *seems* to be this; viz. "If that doctrine be not true which the scripture hath nowhere revealed, and if that doctrine be not false which both Christ and his apostles have expressly testified to be true,



true; then christianity is altogether the most stupid, absurd, and idolatrous system of religion that was ever invented."

BUT in opposition to the groundless and bold assertions of this learned teacher, we have, I hope, fully proved, and demonstrated from the sacred books, that Christ, in divers respects, or rather, to speak properly and scripturally, *in all respects*, is inferior to the Father; and yet we firmly believe and maintain, that "christianity is not a stupid, absurd, idolatrous system of religion," but, on the contrary, is a religion most comfortable and rational: it is a glorious plan of salvation; designed by infinite love, drawn by unerring wisdom, executed by almighty power, and established in righteousness: it is a divine system, perfectly adapted to the state and necessities of fallen men, and every way worthy of the MOST BLESSED GOD, who is the author of it; and it is so far from being the "most gross piece of idolatry," that all idolatry is utterly excluded and destroyed by it—for it reveals and establishes the doctrine of *one self-existent, self-sufficient, almighty GOD*; and of *one mediator* between *that GOD* and fallen men, which mediator, is the man Christ Jesus, who alone is the *express image* of the invisible God; and his only begotten Son; in whom we behold God himself; by whom also, through faith in his blood, we have access unto God, even the Father. The learned bishop of Bristol, in his excellent Dissertations on Prophecy, hath very clearly described the true christian worship which the bible reveals, and commands: "The true christian worship (saith he) is the worship of the ONE ONLY GOD, through the *one only mediator* between God and men, *the man Christ Jesus*; and from this worship the

church of Rome hath notoriously departed, by substituting other mediators."—And in another place he saith, " This is the very essence of *christian worship*, to worship the ONE TRUE GOD, through the *one true Christ*; and to worship any other God, or any other mediator, is apostasy and rebellion against God, and against Christ \*."—All *idolatry*, whether among *pagans* or *papists*, principally consists in this; either in imagining *that* to be God, which is not God, and in serving and worshipping it as such; or in framing and making to themselves images, or idols, as representatives of God; whom they suppose to be always present with their images, and that *something* of true divinity resides in them: therefore they fall down before their idols, pray unto them, and trust in them. Hence also they resent an affront offered to their idol, as much as to the Being, whom it represents; and call them both by one and the same name: see Exod. xxxii. 1—8. Judges xviii. 24. Isaiah xlv. 15. Rom. i. 21, 23. But Jehovah, God the Father, whom we worship, is the living and true God; in opposition to all false gods: and his Son Jesus Christ is the living, and true image of that living, and true God; in opposition to all dead idols, and false images of him: for as there is one true God, so there is one true image of him, as the scripture witnesseth, 2 Cor. iv. 4. Col. i. 15. Heb. i. 3. and Moses, though he could not see God himself, yet he was peculiarly favoured with a sight of his true image: "The *similitude* of Jehovah shall he behold," Num. xii. 8. and in *this true image* of God, true divinity constantly resides:

\* Dr. NEWTON on Prophecy, vol. i. p. 373, 408.

yea God himself ever dwells in him: "for in Christ dwelleth all the fulness of the GODHEAD bodily:" but the image, however perfect, glorious, and express, is not itself the *original*; but that God, of whom he is the image, is the *true original*: and therefore "the head of Christ, is God."

ARG. 5. "The self-existence of Jesus Christ is declared in these words,—Believe that I AM, that I have existence in myself, and exist by a necessity of nature: for I made all things," &c. p. 8.

ANS. 5. This is barely asserted, for the text says no such thing; Christ doth not say, nor do his words mean, I am self-existent, or I am Jehovah; nor doth he add, as a proof of it, "for I made all things:" this is an addition of Mr. Romaine's own, and hath no relation to the subject of the text; see John viii. 24. Nor do I recollect that Christ ever said it: but perhaps some persons may think that the apostles have said it of him, and that is sufficient to justify Mr. Romaine's saying it *here*; I, for my part, think otherwise, for by that addition, the plain design and sense of the text is perverted: besides, when the apostles ascribe creation to Christ, they do not speak of it in the same manner, nor have their words the same meaning: they were divinely inspired, and infallibly led by the Spirit into all truth; and consequently were wiser than any modern teacher of the present age: they have therefore expressed themselves with more caution and propriety. Mr. Romaine's words, which he hath put into the mouth of Christ, though he never spake them, plainly declare that Christ was the *absolute* CREATOR of all



things;—the HE that made all things ; but the apostle's language on the occasion is very different, and is as follows : “ *By him (whom they call the word, and image of GOD, and the first-born of every creature) were all things created,*” and it evidently appears from each of the texts where these things occur ; see John i. 3. Col. i. 15, &c. that *the GOD, with whom the word was, that INVISIBLE GOD, whose image he is, created them by the word ;* and this the apostle expressly tells us in other places. “ *God, saith he, made the worlds by his Son,*” Heb. i. ; and again, “ *God created all things by Jesus Christ,*” Eph. iii. Thus it is plain from the scriptures, that not Christ, but the FATHER, is the ABSOLUTE CREATOR, of whom are all things, 1 Cor. viii. 6. We believe then, as the scripture testifies, that God the Father created all things *by his Son, and created nothing without him : but there is a very material difference between saying of Christ absolutely, that HE made all things ; and saying, that God made all things by him ; or that “ by him were all things created :”* when Christ was upon earth he wrought all manner of miracles, he rebuked the winds and the sea, he raised the dead and cast out devils ; but he took care to tell us, that he did them not *of himself*, but his FATHER who dwelt in him, HE did the works ; and so Peter testifies, that God did them *by Christ* : and thus it was when God created the worlds, he made them, not without, but *by his own Son, his first-begotten, and by him also will God judge the world at the last day.* Now when one person is said to create, or to do any thing by another, it always means, either, 1. *By another's power, or assistance, who is the greater, without whose help the person working could not*  
do

do the works which are ascribed to him ; or else, 2. It means, *by* another person, who is the *less*, as a fit medium, or *instrument* of operation, *by* whom the *greater* works. In one or other of these senses it is always to be understood, when one person is said to work *by* another, especially where one of the persons is God himself, the Almighty : but why should it be thought more incredible, or more impossible with God, to create the worlds *by* his Son ; than that he should work all divine miracles, raise the dead, fill the apostles with the spirit of wisdom and power, and at last judge the world *by* his Son, even *by* the man Christ Jesus ; all which the scripture testifieth God hath done, and will do *by* him. Is any thing too hard for the LORD ? Therefore, when one and the same work is ascribed to two persons acting together, at one and the same time, and the work is said to be *of* the one person, and *by* the other ; the difference between the persons is great, and the distinction manifest : but when all things are said to be *by* God, as well as *of* him, there is then no mention made of more than one single person ; this is evident from Rom. xi. 36. Heb. ii. 10. But for any man to say, that *one almighty person works by another almighty person*, is neither rational nor scriptural ; and is in truth a denying either of the persons to be almighty : for an almighty person can neither need, nor receive the aid or concurrence of any other, in a way of powerful operation ; there being no place for any other to work, because he himself is almighty : but for one almighty person to work by suitable means, and instruments which he hath sovereignly chosen, and hath in his divine wisdom provided, to accomplish his own most holy purposes, is agreeable both to reason, and  
reve-

revelation ; and the only reason which the scripture gives, why God created all things, and reconciles all things to himself, by his first-begotten Son Jesus Christ, is this ; viz. because “ it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell,” Col. i. 19, 20. Moreover, when God would work miracles, and convert souls to himself by the apostles ministry, he poured out upon them of his own Spirit, even a measure of that Spirit which he had first <sup>DE</sup> given to Christ without measure, and this he likewise did <sup>DE</sup> by the hand and ministration of Christ, not without him ; by whom, saith the apostle, we have received grace and apostleship, &c. “ for of his fulness do we all receive, and grace for grace :” when therefore any proper person is said to work by another, it always means, as is above declared, that the person *by* whom another works, is either *greater or less* than himself, and is never a *co-equal* : and if the Holy Spirit be another proper person distinct from God, as some suppose, then the Spirit must be a person inferior to God, because he is said to work *by* his Spirit : but we believe that the Holy Spirit is neither in nature, nor person different from God the Father ; which I think the scripture plainly shews, and the following texts do sufficiently prove it. “ Now HE which stablisheth us in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God, who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts,” 2 Cor. i. 21, 22. And again, “ Ye are sanctified, ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by the Spirit of our God,” 1 Cor. vi. 11. which Holy Spirit, God hath given to them that obey him,” Acts. v. 32. And in the same manner as he quickens, and renews our souls by Christ, through the power of his eternal Spirit ;



so will he likewise raise up, and change our mortal bodies at the last day. This is manifest from these scriptures—  
 “He which raised up the Lord Jesus, shall raise up us also by Jesus,” 2 Cor. iv. 14. “God hath both raised up the Lord, and will raise up us also by his own power,” 1 Cor. vi. 14. “If the Spirit of HIM that raised up Jesus from the dead, dwell in you; HE that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal bodies, by HIS Spirit that dwelleth in you,” Rom. viii. 11.  
 “According to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead,” Eph. i. 19, 20.

ARG. 6. “Our Saviour is frequently called Jehovah in the Old Testament, and thereby the self-existence of the divine nature is ascribed to him. Thus the prophet Isa. xliii. 11. *I, even I, am Jehovah, and besides me there is no Saviour.* There was no Jesus, no Saviour but Jehovah; therefore Jehovah and Jesus are one. And again we read, ch. xlix. 26. *All flesh shall know, that I Jehovah am thy Saviour and thy Redeemer, the mighty one of Jacob.* And the prophet Jeremiah, l. 34. says, *Their Redeemer is strong, Jehovah of hosts is his name*—The name Jehovah belongs to the Redeemer, it is his incommunicable title; and since it is agreed on all hands, that Jehovah signifies the self-existent essence, consequently Jesus Christ is self-existent, for he is Jehovah. This argument is I think very clear and full, and the force of it may be thus summed up: Jehovah is self-existent, but Jesus Christ is Jehovah, therefore he is self-existent.” p. 9, 10.

ANS.

Ans. 6. I marvel that you should think your argument to be "clear and full," though I am glad to find that you only *think* so, for in my humble opinion it is quite the reverse: "Jehovah, you say, is self-existent." In this we agree:—you add, "but Jesus Christ is Jehovah." In this we differ:—you attempt to prove it: in what manner? Why thus; "Our Saviour is frequently called Jehovah," Isa. xliii. &c. But this, my dear Sir, is begging the question; it is the point to be proved, whereas you have taken it for granted, without any proof: for how do you know that the person who there saith, I even I am Jehovah, is Jesus Christ: it is indeed plain that the speaker, whoever he be, is but one single person, and that every other person is thereby excluded from being the one Jehovah. Now *we* believe that the person who there saith, I, even I, am Jehovah, &c, is not Jesus Christ, but God the Father: and this I shall endeavour to prove by the following arguments: 1. The very name Jesus Christ denies him to be Jehovah; for Jesus Christ is that person whom Jehovah hath anointed, and sent to be the Saviour of the world, and is therefore distinguished from Jehovah; see Ps. ii. 2. Acts iv. 20, 27. besides, the person *anointing*, and *sending*, cannot be the same with the person *anointed* and *sent*; but JEHOVAH is the *person anointing* and *sending*, and JESUS CHRIST the *person anointed* and *sent*; therefore the *true* Jesus Christ is not Jehovah. 2. The person who in this chapter saith, "I am Jehovah," is undoubtedly the same that had said in the preceding chapter, "I Jehovah have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles:" and it is agreed on all hands, that

the one Jehovah, who speaks in this text, is God the Father, and that the person to whom he there speaks, is Jesus Christ : therefore not Jesus Christ, but God the Father, is Jehovah our Saviour. 3. We are plainly told that God the Father, is God our Saviour, and, as such, he is also distinguished from Jesus Christ ; see 1 Tim. i. 1. ch. ii. 3, 5. Tit. i. 3, 4. ch. iii. 4, 6. Thus the scripture makes it clear and certain that, as all our salvation is *by* Jesus Christ ; so all our salvation is *of* God the Father ; and even Christ himself, as our Saviour, is of the Father also : therefore it undeniably follows, that *He* who saith, “ I, even I, am Jehovah, and besides me there is no Saviour,” is God the Father. 4. The apostles testify, that JEHOVAH the God of Abraham, who spake by the prophets, is not Jesus Christ, but his Father. “ The God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified his Son,” &c. Acts iii. 13. “ The God of our fathers hath raised up his Son Jesus,” ch. v. 31. “ God, who spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son,” Heb. i. 1, 2. Therefore it is most clearly and fully proved, that the texts which you have cited, must relate to, and were spoken by God the Father : and as the name JEHOVAH, is incommunicable, which you yourself also allow, then, it cannot be given *properly* and *absolutely* to any other person. Jehovah, you further tell us, signifies, the *self-existent essence* : but I beg leave to differ from you : Jehovah is a personal name \*, and

\* “ יהוה, *Jehovah*, *He that is*, the name of the divine *essence* subsisting in three persons, the *v* is formative as in other proper names,” Parkhurst, Lex. It is plain from this note how the most able, and accurate writers contradict themselves, when treating of this subject ; for if Jehovah be a personal name, “ He



and doth not express any *kind* of essence, but denotes *an intelligent Being*, or person subsisting, and is rightly rendered, *He that is*: every Being indeed, exists in some kind of nature or essence, and the divine Being exists in his own divine nature: but the name Jehovah doth not express his *particular nature*, but his personal Being or existence only.—Your argument, throughout the whole of it, is intirely built upon the supposition that no person or Being is called *Jesus*, or is said to save us, except Jehovah only: but this is a great mistake, for Jehovah is often said to *raise up saviours* for his people, and to save us *by* them. And we are exhorted by the apostles both to save ourselves, and one another, Acts ii. 40. 1 Tim. iv. 16. James v. 20. therefore the salvation of sinners is in *some sense* ascribed to Beings who are not Jehovah: many persons likewise are called *Jesus*, i. e. a Saviour, besides Jehovah: thus Moses called the son of Nun, Jehoshua, or Joshua, Num. xiii. 16. whose name in the Greek tongue is *Jesus*; and therefore in the New Testament the same Joshua, is again and again, called *Jesus*: see Acts vii. 45. and Heb. iv. 8. and not only Joshua, but many other persons, have been called by that name: “Jehovah raised up judges

that is,” as Mr. Parkhurst rightly renders it; it cannot be a name of the divine *essence*, for then it should be rendered, *that which is*, and if it respect *three* persons in the essence, it must be plural, and ought to be rendered, *they that are*. Therefore, in my humble opinion, it clearly follows, either that Jehovah is not a personal noun,—or it is not rightly rendered, “He that is,”—or else there are not three persons in the divine essence—But Mr. Romaine, and Mr. Parkhurst are men eminently learned, and critics in the Hebrew tongue, and if I am mistaken in this matter, they can easily set me right, and I wish also to learn from them: yet they must excuse me from receiving their *Ipse dixit* when it contains a palpable contradiction, and is also evidently contrary both to scripture, and common sense.—“Great men are not always wise,” Job xxxii. 9.

which

which delivered," or saved his people Israel, Judges ii. 16. and again, " when the children of Israel cried unto Jehovah ; Jehovah raised up a deliverer, or Saviour, to the children of Israel, who delivered, or saved them," ch. iii. 9. and in the latter days he promised to " send them a Saviour, and a great one, and *he*, saith God, shall deliver them," Isa. xix. 20. The Saviour promised in this place is plainly Jesus Christ ; " for we have seen, saith John, and do testify, that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world," 1 John iv. 14. and it is clear also, that both Joshua, and the Judges, were types of Christ, and therefore each of them was called *Jesus*, or a *Saviour*, because *by* them Jehovah saved his people Israel : the prophet Obadiah also speaks of more Saviours than one, ver. 21. who seem to be no other than those referred to, in the texts above cited from the New Testament. As then many persons besides Jehovah are called Jesus, and are said to save us ; your argument proves nothing : for though Christ be called Jesus, and is truly the Saviour of men, that is no proof of his being Jehovah, because other persons who are not Jehovah, are in the scripture called Jesus, i. e. a Saviour.

2. YOUR mistake is further manifest from hence also ; viz. that the name *Jesus* was *given* to Christ by Jehovah, and was not given to him *because* he is Jehovah, but because he was anointed and sent by him to save his people from their sins, Matt. i. 21. Luke iv. 18. Acts iv. 12. therefore, as the scripture further testifies, the God of Israel, who is the only *true* Jehovah, both sent and raised up his Son, Jesus Christ, to a Saviour ; and gave him the name Jesus, on that very account : see John viii. 42. Acts xiii. 23. Phil. ii. 9. 10. 1 John iv. 14. How then, it may be said, doth the pro-

phet declare there is no Saviour besides JEHOVAH? The reason is plain ; because there never was, is, nor can be any true and effectual deliverer, or *Saviour* of men, besides those particular persons, whom Jehovah himself, at different times, and on special occasions, hath raised up, and invested with authority, and power for that very purpose ; the person likewise so raised up did not, nor could *of himself*, save the people ; but Jehovah, who raised him up to be a Saviour, was always with him, and saved the people *by* him : and therefore Jehovah saith truly, “ there is no Saviour besides me : ” how plain is this matter declared, and how fully is it testified in the scripture ! and how easy to be understood ! and if any one, who professes to regard the scriptures as the true sayings of God, pretend not yet to see it there ; I think it can only be imputed to deeply rooted prejudice, or wilful blindness. In this manner God delivered his people of old, when *He* saved them with a temporal salvation *by* the hands of Moses, Joshua, and the Judges, &c. &c. who were all types of Christ that was to come after ; *by* whom, under the gospel, the same God now delivers and saves his people with an eternal salvation : this truth is most clearly and fully declared by the inspired writers ; but give me leave to cite a few more passages on this head—“ Moses supposed his brethren would have understood how that God *by* his hand would deliver them ; but they understood not,” Acts vii. 25. yet “ this Moses, whom they refused, saying, Who made thee a ruler and a judge ? the same did God send to be a ruler and a deliverer *by* the hand of the angel which appeared to him in the bush, ver. 35. And again, the scripture saith, “ When the LORD raised them up judges,



judges, then the LORD was with the judge, and delivered them out of the hands of their enemies," Judges ii. 18. in like manner when God raised up his Son Jesus to be our Saviour, God was with him, and saves us by him: therefore Christ himself, in the most solemn manner, declared, that he "did nothing of himself, but as his Father had taught him;" he adds, "and he that sent me is with me: the Father hath not left me alone, for I do always those things that please him," John viii. 28, 29. Thus "*all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ:*" "Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is no other name under heaven *given* among men, whereby we must be saved." Of this Jehovah, and his Christ, Zacharias prophesied and spake, when he said, "Blessed be the LORD God of Israel, for he hath visited and redeemed his people, and hath *raised up a horn of salvation* for us, in the house of his servant David; as he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets which have been since the world began: that we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us," Luke i. 68—71. It is therefore manifest that Jehovah, God the Father, is our Saviour in one respect; and his Son Jesus Christ, is our Saviour in another respect: for Jehovah saves us not by giving himself, but by giving his own Son to die for us, and by putting his Spirit upon him, and upholding him: but Christ, God's anointed Son, saves us, not by giving another, but by giving himself, and by laying down his life for us, according to the will of God, even the Father.

3. If these scriptures to which you have referred us be spoken of Christ, they will prove him to be the Father: for Jehovah the God of Abraham, who spake by the prophets,

prophets, is the Father, as is certain from John viii. 57, 58. Acts iii. 13. Heb. i. 1, 2, &c. &c. and on this ground I would ask Mr. Romaine these plain questions : *First*, If Jesus Christ be indeed Jehovah, who then is that person, whom the scripture calls JEHOVAH's *Christ*, and the LORD's *anointed*? see Ps. ii. 2. Luke ii. 26. Acts iv. 26. *Secondly*, If Jesus Christ be the one Jehovah, who then is that person whom the scripture calls the GOD of *Christ*: and the HEAD of *Christ*, Eph. i. 17. 1 Cor. xi. 3. if it be said that the name Christ sometimes means the divine nature, or a divine person; and at other times means the human nature, or a human person; I beg leave to deny it. We, for our part, believe that both the very same nature, and the very same person, is always intended, and meant by the term or name Christ, when it is spoken of the *true Messiah* (for many other persons are called Christ, or the LORD's anointed, in scripture, because they were types of the *true Christ*, 1 Sam. xxvii. 11. Isa. xlv. 1. Lam. iv. 20.) nor doth the scripture ever mention any distinction of nature in the person of Christ, but what respects his rational spirit, and that human body which God prepared for him—he was the Christ of God before he came into the world, and when he was in the world; and now he is departed out of the world unto the Father, he is still the Christ of God: he is the very same person in all places and in all conditions, whether as a pure spirit, or incarnate; whether in his humiliation on earth, or in his exaltation in heaven; whether hanging on a cross, or sitting on the right hand of God, Ps. lxx. 17. Prov. viii. 23. 2 Cor. xiii. 4. 2 Tim. i. 9. 1 John iv. 2. Heb. xiii. 8. and the apostle tells us very plainly why Christ the WORD was made flesh; see Heb. ii. 14, 17. To me  
therefore

therefore it seems evident from the scripture, that whoever affirms of Christ, that *he* is JEHOVAH the LIVING GOD ; doth thereby most certainly deny him to be the *true Christ* and the *true Son* of GOD : nor is this truth at all affected by what any one may imagine, or say of the essence, or generation of Christ ; for it is undeniably true, that as the scripture testifies there is but one living and true God ; so it equally testifies that Jesus of Nazareth is *his* Son, and *his* Christ.

4. IF the texts you have quoted be spoken of the Son, as you suppose, then the Father is not Jehovah, nor the Saviour at all, for it is evident that the prophets speak all along of one single person : “ *I, even I, am Jehovah, and besides me there is no Saviour,*” &c. therefore there is no Saviour *who is* JEHOVAH, besides that person who speaks in the text : so that your doctrine plainly denies the Father to be Jehovah, our Saviour : and hence it comes to pass, that he who denieth the Son, denieth the Father also. The common opinion, that the name JEHOVAH signifies the *divine nature*, and not the *DIVINE BEING, as personally subsisting*, is a great mistake ; for I will engage to prove that the name Jehovah always denotes what we mean by a proper person, viz. *one single intelligent agent*. This, I say, I will engage to prove by *every note, or character whereby we usually prove, or can prove, any Being in heaven or earth, to be a proper person* : and if so, then the name Jehovah never signifies the *abstract nature*, or essence of God, but always means a proper divine person ; and the scripture constantly declares, that HE, JEHOVAH, is but one person only. It is common in our day for certain preachers to tell  
their



their hearers that Christ is JEHOVAH JESUS: they may think perhaps that they have scripture warrant for it from some such texts as are now under consideration: but I hope it hath been made plainly to appear, that JEHOVAH JESUS in those texts doth not mean *Christ*, but GOD the FATHER; and so it always means throughout the scripture: if then the unlearned hearer would not wish to be imposed upon and deceived, I exhort him, whenever he hears JEHOVAH JESUS mentioned, always to understand by it, God the Father; for in scripture it never means any other person; and if the preacher apply it to any other, he either mistakes, or perverts the text.

ARG. 7. "In this sense our Lord says in the text, If ye believe not that I AM, that Jehovah is *in* me of a truth, ye shall die in your sins." I AM cannot relate to his created being: all the sophistry of Arianism and Socinianism cannot wrest the words to such a sense, because the Jews could not but believe that he existed, when they heard him say, "I AM." The translators have done great injury to this scripture by inserting the word *be*, I AM *be*, which is not in the original, and by putting it in they have destroyed both the sense of the passage, and also the force of the argument: for I AM *be* ought to refer to something said: but it has no reference, no sort of connection, either with what goes before or follows after."

p. 10, 11.

ANS. 7. In my humble opinion, the translators have not destroyed, but have given the true sense of the passage, and that for this very reason, because *I am*, refers to something

I

thing

thing said : I am indeed astonished how you could venture to affirm, that the expression, *I am*, in this text, “ has no reference, no sort of connection either with what goes before, or follows after.” Dr. Guyse, a learned and judicious expositor, is of a quite contrary opinion : his exposition of the text is as follows, “ And therefore I told you, (ver. 21.) that ye shall utterly and dreadfully perish for, and in your iniquities ; and particularly your unbelief ; which leaves you under the power of all other sins : for if through the carnality, hardness, and impenitence of your hearts, ye will not believe that I am *he* who should come a light into the world, (ver. 12.) as the only Saviour ; there is no help, or hope but that ye must be cut off in your sins, by the righteous vengeance of God upon your city, and nation in this world ; and by a still more terrible destruction, in the world to come.” In a note, he adds, “ That I AM *he*, is in the Greek, that I AM, which some suppose refers to that name of God (Exod. iii. 14.) where he calls himself I AM ; but in this place it rather seems to be an elliptical form of speech with respect to his being the Messiah, as this very expression is undoubtedly to be understood (Mark xiii. 6.) Many shall come in my name, saying, that *I am*, i. e. *the Christ* ; and (Acts xiii. 25.) John said, I am not. i. e. *he*, or *the Messiah*.” The doctor, you see, though a man of your own party, yet in this particular he witnesses against you : and I much question if ever any person before Mr. Romaine hath so much as imagined, what you have here most confidently asserted.—I wonder how we shall know when words have a connection with what goes before or follows after, if these do not : is it not plainly one intire connected dis-

course between Christ and the Jews, from ver. 12 to ver. 29? For when Christ had said to them, ver. 24. "If ye believe not that *I am (be)* ye shall die in your sins;" did they not immediately reply, "*Who art thou?*" and can any thing more plainly shew the connection? Besides, if Christ had here called himself Jehovah, would not the Jews have understood him? were they ignorant of their own language? and would they not also have stoned him? It is to me unaccountably strange how you could thus mistake, and misrepresent the sacred text: is it not a sign that your cause is bad, if it stand in need of such sophistry? "*I AM*, you say, cannot relate to his *created being*, because the Jews could not but believe that he existed when they heard him say *I am*:" and of that they might have been as fully convinced by their seeing, or feeling, as well as by their hearing: but doth not *εγω ειμι*, *I am*, sometimes occur in scripture in an *elliptical* form, or as an *imperfect speech*, the true meaning whereof cannot be ascertained, unless something be understood, or added to it? nay, it is not certain that the words *εγω ειμι* are ever used in your sense of them, that is, as denoting *bare existence*. Exod. iii. 14. is no proof of it, which we shall endeavour to shew, by-and-by. But you insinuate, that when Christ said *I am*, the expression could only relate to his *simple being*, or *self-existence*: whereas it most generally, if not always, respects something else, and is only intended to point out, or declare the *identity* of the person, about whom the inquiry is made. Is not then your arguing artful and evasive? or is fallacious reasoning, *sophistry* in a *unitarian* only, and not in a *trinitarian* also? The apostle tells us, that the man who

I

judgeth



judgeth another, condemns himself ; when he himself doth the same things. To me then it appears plain and certain, that when Christ said to the Jews, *I am*, he thereby told them, and intended to declare, that he was the very person promised of God in the holy scriptures, and therein described, and well known by the name, and character of the *Messiah*, Son of David, Son of man, Son of God—the *he* that should come—the *true* CHRIST ; whom the Jews were then looking for, but did not yet know, or else would not believe, that HE was that very person, the true Messiah : therefore the pronoun *he* is necessarily understood, and is well supplied by the translators : which I hope will more fully appear from the consideration of a few other texts : for our Lord made use of a similar mode of speech, ch. iv. 26. to the woman of Samaria : did the woman understand thereby that he called himself Jehovah ? Nothing less ; hear what she saith, ver. 29. “ Come see *a man*—that told me all things, that ever I did, is not this *the Christ* ? She knew very well when he said to her, “ I that speak unto thee am *he*, that he thereby declared himself to be the Christ, and as such she believed on him, and that not, as Jehovah, but as a man ; who is the *true Christ*, the promised seed of the woman, of Abraham, and of David —The man also born blind, whose eyes Christ had opened, makes use of the very same expression, ch. ix. 9. and as the words are exactly the same, there is no more reason, from the *bare form of the expression*, to suppose that when Christ said *I am*, he called himself Jehovah, than there is to suppose it of the blind man, when he said *I am*, for the word *he* is not in the original. Our Lord frequently made use of the very same expression ; but always with reference to some person,

or character before-mentioned, to which the words constantly refer; thus in John xviii. 4, 5, 6. when he had asked his betrayers, "Whom seek ye?" and they had answered, "Jesus of Nazareth, Jesus said unto them, *I am*," i. e. I am the very person, that same Jesus of Nazareth, whom ye seek, ver. 8. Likewise when the high priest asked Jesus, "Art thou the Christ the Son of the blessed?" "Jesus said, *I am*," Mark xiv. 61, 62. i. e. I am he, I am the Christ, the Son of the blessed God: compare also Mark xiii. 6. with Matthew xxiv. 5. But when he said, *I am*, John viii. 58. the present tense seems to be used for the preter, as in ch. iii. 13. and xii. 17. and is, as if he had said, I had a being before Abraham, which was the point in question; but the words do by no means declare his particular kind of being, or nature. It is also probable, that he then spake of himself, as the person whom God had chosen, and anointed to be the Saviour of men, not only before Abraham was, but also before the world was; and that, as such, Abraham believed in him, rejoiced to see his day, and was glad. And whereas he sustained the same character and office in all ages, viz. that of the *anointed Saviour*, as his name, Jesus Christ, imports, see Heb. xiii. 8. therefore he might with propriety say *I am*, i. e. "I am that person whom God anointed and set up from everlasting, to be the Saviour of sinners, and now in the fulness of time he hath sent me into the world for that very purpose. Prov. viii. 23. Mic. v. 2. Gal. iv. 4, 5. But it is evident from verses 54, 55. that Christ did not declare himself to be the God of the Jews, or say that he was Jehovah, nor do his words at all mean it: and that he never did it, seems plain to me even from this single consideration, viz. that when his enemies sought  
for

for false witnesses against him to put him to death, they never once charged him with it: which doubtless they would not failed to have done, if he ever had said it: for although some of the more ignorant among the multitude pretended once, and again, to put that meaning on his words, and therefore sought to stone him as a blasphemer (and there is no doubt but his enemies in power were fully informed of it;) yet the high priest and rulers bring no such accusation against him: for they very well knew that when he called God "his own Father," he did not make himself equal with God; and that when he said, "I and the Father are one," *he did not thereby make himself God*, and that persons who were capable of drawing such inferences from his words, must be extremely weak or prejudiced; which Christ himself also, in his answers to them, hath clearly shewn and demonstrated; see John v. 19—30. ch. x. 32—38. and therefore Caiaphas and his associates, when they sat in judgment upon Christ, tho' they endeavoured to fix upon him the charge of blasphemy, yet never so much as pretended that he called himself God.—But to proceed:—our Lord's meaning, in ver. 24. of this chapter, is further evident from ver. 28. wherein he plainly refers to what he had before spoken in ver. 24. for there he had said, "If ye believe not that *I am*, ye shall die in your sins;" and in ver 28. he saith, "When ye have lift up the son of man, then shall ye know that *I am*," and that I do nothing of myself. The word *be* is not in the original in either of the texts, but is rightly supplied in our translation: and you can with no more truth, or shew of reason apply the words *I am*, to Christ, as Jehovah, in ver. 24. than you can in ver. 28. but in this last passage he declares that the "*I am*, whom he there speaks of, *did*



*nothing of himself;*" and as you cannot with any propriety, or truth apply this to a self-existent person; it clearly follows, that Christ could neither speak nor mean it of such a person: and therefore the pronoun *he*, or *the Christ*, is necessarily understood, and ought to be supplied in this passage. — But happily for the sake of truth, as Dr. Ridgley speaks of some other trinitarians, you seem to have overturned both your own doctrine, and argument: for you plainly interpret Christ's expression, *I am*, to mean the same, and no more, than if he had said, "JEHOVAH is *in* me." here you speak right, both rational and scriptural, and declare the very same thing that we believe, and are contending for; but there is a wide difference between a person's saying "I am JEHOVAH," or "I am SELF-EXISTENT;" and saying "JEHOVAH is *in* me;" for the latter expression plainly declares, that *not he himself*, but the *person in* him, was JEHOVAH: to this part, then, of your doctrine we agree, as being the truth of God, though not the meaning of this text. — And if it be not what you *intended* in the passage before us, yet I am certain it is the *sense* of your words: for after you have cited several texts from the prophets, in order to prove that Christ is Jehovah, as Isa. xliii. 11, &c. &c. you immediately add, "in this sense our Lord says in the text, If ye believe not that *I am*, that JEHOVAH is *in* me, of a truth, ye shall die," &c. Now by "*our Lord*," you cannot here mean *Jehovah*, because you say *Jehovah* is *in* him; therefore by the expression, *our Lord*, you must mean the man Christ Jesus, who, according to your ideas, not *mine*, is a *mere creature*. Therefore, after all that you have said about the matter, your words, and arguing, in my opinion, only declare,

declare, and serve to prove, that our Lord Jesus Christ is a created being, and that he was in no other sense Jehovah, but as he had Jehovah *in* him ; and that all the texts which you have quoted from the Old Testament have no other meaning in them : and here I agree with you in every point but this ; viz. your reckoning our Lord Jesus Christ to be *a mere created being* ; but we say he was *begotten*, not made, Col. i. 15 : for else we are both agreed in believing, and teaching that Jehovah was *in* him, But as Christ constantly declared that the person who dwelt *in* him was the FATHER, and you say the person *in* him was JEHOVAH, therefore I infer that the Father of Christ is JEHOVAH, and that there is none other but HE ; for I take it for granted that Mr. Romaine firmly believes, there is but one JEHOVAH.

ARG. 8. " When God sent Moses to the Israelites with this divine name I AM ; and when Christ, who never scrupled to call himself God, assumed the same name I AM, certainly the same words spoken on the same subject, must convey the same idea of self-existence." p. 12.

ANS. 8. I AM *that* I AM, Exod. iii. 14. is not an exact translation of the original, as you very well know ; nor doth our version, in my opinion, express its true meaning. The Hebrew אֲנִי אֶהְיֶה אֲנִי properly rendered is, " I WILL BE *that* I WILL BE," which words plainly declare something future, and they evidently point at the deliverance of the children of Israel, and that in consequence of the covenant which God had made with their fathers. The divine sovereignty also may be intended by them, for it is written of the most high God, that " he  
worketh

worketh all things after the counsel of his own will," and hence he saith, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy." I conceive therefore that the word *אֶהְיֶה* *I will be*, is no proper name of the DIVINE BEING, nor is intended to declare his *self-existence*; but rather the sovereignty of his will, and the stability of his covenant. The words may I think be thus paraphrased: "I will be that to Abraham and his seed, which I will be, and have promised to be. My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure. I have entered into covenant with them, and I will inviolably keep it: I have sworn to bless them, and I will surely perform it: no unworthiness of theirs shall hinder it—no opposition of their enemies shall prevent it. I will surely have mercy on my people, and will be exalted in their salvation; I will also harden the Egyptians, and will be exalted in their destruction. Go therefore and tell the Israelites, "I WILL BE *that* I WILL BE:" I will faithfully perform my ancient promises unto Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to whom I have sworn by my great name, that I will be a God unto them, and to their seed after them: I have spoken it, and I will do it." This I take to be the sense of the passage; for it evidently relates to the performance of God's covenant, which he had made with Abraham, and with his seed for ever—see Gen. xv. 13, 14, 18. ch. xvi. 3, 4.

THAT the word is not used for a proper name, nor intended to express the self-existence of the divine Being, appears plain to me for these reasons: 1. Because the Hebrew word *אֶהְיֶה* *I will be*, is not a *noun*, but a *verb*; but all proper names are nouns: the *Seventy*, it is true, have



have rendered the words *εγω ειμι ο ων*, "I *am*, HE THAT IS," but this *Greek* version is not an exact translation of the *Hebrew*: the *Greek* indeed makes sense of the words, which, as I conceive, the *English* doth not: for if a person say in our tongue, "*I am that I am*:" have the words any determinate meaning, or is there any sense in them, unless something be supplied, or understood? for still it must be asked, What, or who art thou? But if the words in our *English* version have no proper meaning in them, then it is certain they do not give us the sense of the original.

2. THAT God did not intend thereby to declare his divine name, as the self-existent God, is further plain to me from the words immediately following, which are these—"And thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, JEHOVAH, the GOD of your Fathers, &c. hath sent me unto you: *This is my name for ever*, and this is my memorial unto all generations," ver. 15, 16. but this name is not the word *איהוה* *I will be*, but יהוה JEHOVAH,

3. WHEN Moses went to speak unto the children of Israel, he did not once make use of the word *איהוה* as the name of God, but constantly made use of the name JEHOVAH: Now can it be imagined, if *איהוה* had been that name of God, by which Moses was to make him known to the Israelites, that he would not so much as once have mentioned it *as such*?

4. IT is I think unreasonable to suppose *איהוה* to be one of the proper names of the God of Israel, for I do not

find that the prophets have at any time made use of it, *as the name of God*, throughout the Old Testament; they never use the word אלהים as the name of the God of their fathers, but they always say יהוה JEHOVAH—"JEHOVAH is his *memorial*," that is to say, Jehovah is that peculiar incommunicable name of the true God, whereby he is distinguished from all gods, and from all other beings both in heaven and earth, "Jehovah is God of gods and LORD of lords," Deur. x. 17.—Neither were the words of Christ in John viii. 24. spoken (as Mr. Romaine hath supposed) of the same subject, as those were in Exod. iii. 14. which I think must be manifest to every considerate reader, who will take the pains to compare the two passages together. And for a person simply to say *I am*, seems to me an imperfect sentence, void of meaning; and therefore, in order to make sense of it, some other word ought to be understood, tho' not expressed; unless it refer to something beforementioned. Thus when the divine Being declares himself to be the true God, he no-where simply says, *I am*; but "*I am GOD*," or "*I am JEHOVAH*," or "*I am HE*:" this I think is the constant stile of the sacred writers. I conceive then that אהיה, wrongly translated *I am*, and rightly rendered *I will be*, is no proper name of the God of Israel; nor did Moses so understand it, or ever use it in that sense: but the word is chiefly intended to declare the immutability of Jehovah's counsel, and the steadfastness of his covenant: for the time being fully come whereof he spake, and promised to Abraham, that he would deliver his seed from the hand of their oppressors, and give unto them the land of Canaan for an inheritance; see Gen. xv. 13—15. he was therefore *now* come down to execute his

his divine purpose, perform his covenant, and fulfil his promises; and thereby he would *manifest* himself to be what his great name JEHOVAH imports, viz. an *unchangeable* BEING, a *faithful* GOD: and for this reason he said to Moses, “ I appeared unto Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob by the name of God Almighty אל שדי God all-sufficient, but by my name JEHOVAH, as that GLORIOUS BEING who is ever the same, and changeth not: *with whom there is no variableness neither shadow of turning*; I was not known to them. For the fulfilment of the divine promises, the *great proof* of JEHOVAH’s *immutability*, had not been performed unto *them*, but was now to be performed to their seed after them. And that this is the true sense and meaning of the passage, appears plain to me from the following scriptures; see Exod. vi. 2—8. Mal. iii. 6. Acts. vii. 5. Heb. xi. 13. Therefore Mr. Romaine’s argument drawn from Exod. iii. 14. is quite foreign to his purpose, for the text hath no such meaning, as he hath supposed,

2. I GREATLY wonder how you could venture to tell us, that “ Christ never scrupled to call himself God.” I hope Mr. Romaine will permit me to ask him in which of the evangelists this matter is recorded? I have diligently searched the sacred books, and as yet I have not found one single text, in all the New Testament, where Christ is said to have called himself God; but on the contrary I there find, that he often, and in express terms, declared himself to be the *Son* of God, and that the TRUE GOD was *his* FATHER: and his faithful apostles have likewise testified the same thing of him. See Mark xiv. 61, 62. Luke xxii. 70. John vi. 69. ch. ix.



35. 37. ch. x. 36. Acts viii. 37. As then the testimony of the sacred books cannot be false, your declaration, because it contradicts them, cannot be true.

ARG. 9. "The Trinity in unity is thus expressed in scripture, 1 John v. 7. *There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.* "One, says the unbeliever, how can that be? how can three be one? That's a contradiction." If it be, it is a contradiction of his own making: for unless they be three in the same respect as they are one, which opinion could never be maintained by any man in his senses, then he must take the contradiction upon himself." p. 13.

ANS. 9. We have agreed to refer this matter to the judgment of the inspired writers; therefore not human reason, but divine revelation, must settle the point between us: but if 1 John v. 7. be the only text you can produce in support of your doctrine, it is a sign that it is not very clearly revealed in the bible. Surely there is no great doctrine in the scripture but what is plainly attested by *two*, or *three* witnesses: and as to that single text which you have here cited, many great divines, as Mr. Romaine very well knows, have denied it to be authentic, and I believe he cannot certainly prove it to be genuine: nor is its divine origin to be disputed merely on this account, because the text is said to be found only in a few copies, and these of later date than those which have it not\*;

\* See Scripture Sufficiency, p. 3.

but

but other reasons also may be urged against its authenticity : for in the first place, there is no other text in all the scripture, where the same thing is declared either in express terms, or by necessary consequence ; but this cannot be said of any other great article of the christian faith. 2. It seems doubtful from the very scope of the passage itself ; for ver. 7. doth not appear to have any proper connection, in the true meaning of it, either with ver. 6. or ver. 8. : but ver. 6. properly connects with ver. 8. and ver. 8. with ver. 9. ; and that in their obvious sense and meaning : so that ver. 7. seems to have no true connection either with what goes before or follows after : for it appears from the 9th, 10th, and 11th verses, where the whole matter is summed up and applied ; that what the apostle calls the witness of God, is only *that* of the *Spirit*, and of the *water*, and of the *blood*, as mentioned in ver. 8. and no notice is at all taken of ver. 7. He moreover tells us, that it is the witness of GOD, viz. of one single person, even the FATHER, for it is the witness of God concerning *his* SON, which witness is also for our sakes ; for it is declared to be given for this very end, that we may know and believe that God hath given to us eternal life, in his Son, and that we might continue to believe on the name of the Son of God, ver. 11, 13. so that he speaks nothing of a witness in heaven, which is far off, and hid from us ; but only of a witness on earth, which is present with us, and in us. Now this great and blessed truth, viz. that God hath given to us eternal life in his Son, he witnesseth to us, both by the *blood* of his Son redeeming us, and by the *water* of purification sanctifying us, and by the further gift of his *Spirit* as the earnest

earnest of the heavenly inheritance, and to witness also with our spirits that we are the children of God, by faith in Christ Jesus: and this threefold witness God gave to the believing Gentiles of old, first "purifying their hearts by faith," and then bearing them witness, "by giving to them his Holy Spirit," Acts xv. 8, 9: therefore the Spirit, the water, and the blood, are here said to witness, and to agree in one; because they jointly testify this one truth, that God, according to his promise, hath given to believers on his Son, eternal life: and this their witness is called the record, or witness of God, because *thereby* God testifies, and assures us of it, Ezek. xxxvi. 25—27. Acts v. 32. 1 John iv. 13. Thus "Christ is made of God unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption," and not only so, but he gives us likewise his Holy Spirit, "that we may *know* the things which are freely given to us *of* God," 1 Cor. ii. 21. see also 1 Tit. iii. 5, 6, 7. But should we admit the text to be genuine, yet *your doctrine* is not declared in it, nor can be proved by it: even Beza himself will not allow it to mean what you have supposed. For how doth Mr. Romaine know, that the word *one* in this place means one God, or one Being, or one *essence*: if you can make it appear from any other passage, that the pronoun *ew*, *unum*, *one*, is used in that sense throughout the scripture, I will readily grant that it may *possibly* mean so here; but I cannot assent to what you have barely asserted *without proof*; especially as I find when two or more things, or persons, are said, in scripture, to be *one*, it never means one person, or essence; but it constantly means *one* by agreement, or by union, and no more: for a proof of this, I



refer you to the following passages: "Take thee *one* stick, and write upon it for Judah, &c. Then take *another* stick, and write upon it for Joseph, &c.—and join them one to another, into one stick, and they shall become *one* in thine hand," Ezek. xxxvii. 16, 17. "The multitude of them that believed were of *one* heart, and of *one* soul," Acts iv. 31. "He is our peace, who hath made both *one*," Eph. ii. 14. "He that planteth and he that watereth are *one*," 1 Cor. iii. 8. "Know ye not that he which is joined to a harlot, is *one* body—but he that is joined to the Lord is *one* Spirit," ch. vi. 16, 17. "I and my Father are *one*—that ye may know and believe that the Father is *in* me and I *in* him," John x. 30, 38. "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be *one*, as we are"—"And the glory which thou gavest me, I have given them: that they may be *one*, even as we are *one*. I in them and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in *one*," ch. xvii. 11, 22, 23.—Now is it not most plain, and manifest from these passages, that when the scripture speaks of two or more bodies, or spirits, or persons, as being *one*, it never means *oneness* of being, or essence; but always intends, and signifies a *oneness* of mind and will, or of their persons, being *actually joined together*: by which union they become *one*: and on no other account, are two, or more persons (except in a political sense) ever said to be *one*; whether the union be natural or spiritual: therefore your sense of 1 John v. 7. is evidently wrong, and not according to the scripture usage of the pronoun *one*; when two or more beings are said to be *one*: consequently that text makes nothing for your purpose, nor is it any  
proof

proof of your doctrine : for should the text be allowed to be genuine, and to speak of three proper persons, yet the apostle's saying, " these three are *one*," would be no proof of their being *co-essential*, or *co-equal* persons ; for I do not find that the pronoun *one* is ever used in that sense, either in common language, or in the sacred writings : *different* natures, as well as those of the same kind ; *unequal* persons, as well as co-equal may become one, and be called *one* with propriety ; because the oneness always respects, either their *agreement* in one and the same thing, as one in purpose, will, interest, work, and testimony ; or else it respects their being actually *joined together*, which is proper union ; whereby they mutually inhabit, and possess each other. Thus God the Father dwelleth in Christ his Son, and the Son in the Father : and thus the believer dwelleth in Christ, and Christ in him : on which account they are said to be *one*.

2. YOUR system I think, though you will not allow it, makes them to be *three* in the very same respect as they are *one*. For if you make each person GOD, or JEHOVAH, in the full and proper sense of the word, and at the same time assert that the three persons together are but one God, but one Jehovah : do you not plainly declare that they are three in the same respect, as they are one ? or is a contradiction with respect to Deity less absurd, and more tolerable, than a contradiction with respect to personality ?—Is not this your doctrine : " There is but one Jehovah, and in this Jehovah there are three persons, *each* of which, *by himself*, is Jehovah" ? If so, you certainly make them to be three, in the very same respect, as they are one : and again, you  
make

make them to be one in the very same respect as they are three; for, as three, by your hypothesis, they are three Gods, three Jehovahs; and as one, they are one God, one Jehovah: and if this be not to make them three in the same respect as they are one, words I think cannot at all declare it. It is to no purpose to say you do not make them three, in the same respect as they are one, with regard to personality; this I know is pretended, but it is mere evasion: for if you do this with respect to Deity, it equally affects your argument, and proves the self-contradiction of your hypothesis: nor is it of any force to say that by Jehovah you mean the *self-existent essence*, the abstract nature of Deity (tho' in that you err likewise) for if JEHOVAH mean the whole of the essence, and the divine nature cannot be divided, then to suppose three persons in that essence, each possessing the fulness of it, is to make three Jehovahs; or if but a part of the essence, then it denies either of the persons, in a full and proper sense, to be Jehovah—Therefore, in my humble opinion, the trinitarian system cannot avoid the above contradiction on any ground but this; viz. that the one Jehovah is three persons, and that neither of the persons, by himself, without including the other two is Jehovah: upon this ground, and upon no other, can the self-contradiction be avoided; for so long as they continue to maintain that there are three distinct divine persons, and that *each* of these is *by himself* Jehovah, the true God; and at the same time affirm that there is but *one* Jehovah; the contradiction is self-evident, and palpable: yet I will not say that Mr. Romaine, who seems to maintain this, is not a man in his senses; for many men, in other respects wise and sensible, have



held and maintained a plain contradiction. Is it not a contradiction to say that a person *begotten*, or a *derived* Being, is that God who is *self-existent*, and *undervived*? and yet Mr. Romaine knows, that many wise, and good men have held, this plain contradiction. But if you think proper to drop the contradiction, I conceive it can only be done, either by acknowledging that *one* of the persons *alone*, is the only true God (which will be giving up the point in dispute) or else by maintaining that neither of the three persons, *by himself*, but that all of them together, are the one true God : and then it will follow, that when Jehovah speaks, or is said to do this, or that, it never means *one* person, but *three*; but this cannot be supposed without denying the plainest parts of the bible, for in that sacred book, JEHOVAH the living God constantly speaks, and is spoken of, in the *singular number*, as of one person only : and this the trinitarians themselves constantly declare, when they say that God is one, and pray, and give thanks unto him, as to one single person, in the name of Christ, and as their Mediator, with *that one* God : but they again as constantly contradict themselves, and the scriptures likewise, when they take upon them to assert, that this same Mediator is himself that God, with whom he mediates.

ARG. 10. " If nothing remain for the infidel to object to the state of the doctrine, what can he offer against the scripture explanation of it ? There can be no difficulty but what arises from the names of the divine persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and these have been a great handle of objection, and are still with unbelievers, who  
are

are so blinded with their vices, that they know nothing of the true sense and meaning of scripture, but only look into it for matter of cavil: they suppose, with ignorance common to infidelity, that these names were to give us ideas of the manner, in which the persons exist in the essence, but the scripture had a quite different view in using them." p. 15.

ANS. 10. If all who have held, and maintained, that the names of Father, Son, and Spirit were to give us ideas of their *manner* of existing; that is to say, that God the Father *begat* the Son, and *therefore* HE is called the FATHER; and that the Son was *begotten* of the Father, and *therefore* HE is called the SON, &c.; if, I say, all who have held and believed this, were ignorant men and infidels; then the authors of the *Nicene*, and *Athanasian* creeds certainly were so; and not they only, but the bulk of professing christians in the *western* churches for above a thousand years past, not excepting our Protestant *reformers*, and *martyrs*: it is true they were fallible men, and might be mistaken, though I do not reckon them to be more ignorant than those of our day, the *Hutchinsonians* themselves not excepted; much less would I rank them with infidels.—But you tell us, “the scripture had a quite different view in using them.” If you can make this appear, we will readily own that these good men were mistaken. But how shall we know that the scripture had a *different view* in making use of these names? for you have not referred us to one single text, as a proof of it. And can you direct us to any part of the sacred books where this thing is mentioned? Have you yourself

ever seen it in the bible? If not, why did you assert it? And if you have, why did you not refer us to it? I for my part have not been able to find any such thing, and if you can point me to the passage, where your account of the matter is recorded, I shall very gladly receive the information.—It is much easier to assert a thing, than to prove it.—Our *trinitarian forefathers*, it seems, could not see it there; or else they have not been honest enough to declare it: for it is notorious that their account of the matter, is quite opposite to yours—But let us hear what Mr. Romaine hath further to say on this subject.

ARG. 11. “The scripture informs us, St. Paul frequently, Eph. i. 4. ch. iii. 11. 2 Tim. i. 9. Tit, i. 2, &c. and 1 Pet. i. 20. that the covenant of grace was made before the world, and the gracious plan of man’s salvation was settled before he had his being.—According to the plan of this covenant, one of the divine persons agreed to demand infinite satisfaction for sin, when mankind should offend, and to be the Father of the human nature of Jesus Christ, and our Father through him; and therefore he is called God the Father, not to describe his nature, but his office. Another of the divine persons covenanted to become a son, to take our nature upon him, and in it to pay the infinite satisfaction for sin, and therefore he is called *Son*, *Son of God*, and such-like names, not to describe his divine nature, but his divine office: another of the divine persons covenanted,” &c. p. 16.

ANS. 11. The above texts, to which you have referred the reader, say not a word about *your views*, &c.: nor do they represent the *plan* of the covenant of grace, as you have  
here



here stated it, but rather they give us a very different account of the matter : we will just cite the words at length, which are as follows : “ According as he (viz. God the Father) hath chosen us in him (viz. Christ) before the foundation of the world,” Eph. i. 4.—“ According to the eternal purpose which he (God the Father) purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord,” ch. iii. 11.—“ Who (God the Father) hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began,” 2 Tim. i. 9. “ in hope of eternal life which God that cannot lye promised before the world began,” Tit. i. 2.—“ who (Christ) was verily fore-ordained before the foundation of the world,” 1 Pet. i. 20. Now these texts say nothing at all of *three co-equal* divine persons ; *nor is there one word about their covenanting* and agreeing to assume *official* characters, or to sustain three distinct offices : not a tittle of any *view* that one divine person had in taking the name of *Father*, and another in taking the name of *Son*, &c.—There is not the most distant hint of any such thing : how then could Mr. Romaine come by the knowledge of it ? or by what authority did he assert it ? nay, it is evident that in these texts only *two* persons are mentioned : and but *one* of them is called God, who all along is declared to act as a sovereign : for of *him* it is said, that *he* purposed, *he* chose, *he* gave us grace in Christ, &c. The apostle likewise declares that the divine person, who did all this, is no other than “ the GOD and FATHER of our Lord Jesus Christ,” Eph. i. 3. *who*, even the Father, is that same HE of whom the apostle again testifies, that he “ worketh all things

after the counsel of *his own will*," ver. 11. therefore as the FATHER *himself* did all this, and that of his own will; it is certain no other person whatsoever was concerned with him, in contriving the divine plan of man's salvation: Christ indeed, *in* whom the divine purpose was made, was then present with God his Father, and heartily concurred with him in his gracious design, and glorious purpose to save men, in and *by* him his first-born Son: this I think is intimated Matt. xi. 25, 26. Prov. viii. 30, 31. but Christ had no hand in the *planning* of it, for God the Father himself did it, *in* Christ. HE purposed, and HE gave us grace in Christ before the world began, as hath been already manifested from the scripture; therefore the apostle testifies, "to us there is but *one* God the FATHER, of whom are all things," 1 Cor. viii. 6. which perfectly agrees with Christ's own testimony; who saith, "all things are delivered unto me of my Father," Matt. xi. 20. Thus the scriptures plainly declare, that *one divine person alone*, viz. GOD the FATHER, both purposed, and planned, and doth and will execute the salvation of all his chosen people, in all the several parts thereof, and in all its fulness, *in*, and *by* his *only begotten*, and anointed Son, Jesus Christ our Lord: Paul therefore was not mistaken, nor a false witness, when he testified that "all things are of God (viz. the Father) who hath reconciled us to himself, *by* Jesus Christ," 2 Cor. v. 18.

2. MR. Romaine tells us that "one of the divine persons covenanted to be the Father of Christ's *human nature*," consequently the other two must stand excluded from that relation: but if the Holy Spirit be another distinct

distinct person, I cannot see, how Mr. Romaine will be able to reconcile his plan, and doctrine with Matt. i. 20. Luke i. 35. for it is certain from thence that Christ was begotten of the Holy Spirit—Again, if one *divine person* *covenanted* to be the Father of Christ's human nature, as Mr. Romaine likewise tells us, and *therefore that same divine person* is *always* in scripture called *God the Father*; it necessarily follows, that whensoever, and wheresoever the scripture calls God, the Father of Christ, and our Father through him; it always means *one single divine person*, exclusive of all others; therefore Mr. Romaine cannot say, consistent with his own plan, that by the name Father is meant *three persons*, in any part of the bible; because he here tells us, it was agreed upon in the divine covenant that *one* of the persons was to be the Father, and that this divine person is revealed to us in scripture by the name of GOD the FATHER: how then will Mr. Romaine reconcile Matt. vi. 9. John xvii. 3. 1 Cor. viii. 6. 1 Thess. i. 9, 10. with his doctrine of God being *three persons*?

3. You further tells us, that “another of the divine persons *covenanted* to become a Son,” &c. but whence did you learn this also? I find no such thing in the sacred books: besides, Mr. Romaine had told us before, that one of the divine persons covenanted to become the FATHER of the *human nature* of Christ, how then doth he here say that “another *divine person covenanted* to become a son, to take the human nature, &c.?” can these things be reconciled? for if one divine person covenanted to be a Father to that *human nature* which another divine person should assume; certainly this second divine person must  
likewise



likewise covenant, that his human nature, and *not his divine person*, should stand in the relation of a Son to the first; else the *second* divine person would not have agreed to be that to the first, which the first had agreed to be unto the second.

BUT was it from weakness, or design that Mr. Romaine hath made the divine persons to disagree in this particular? for should any one now affirm that Mr. Romaine denies Christ to be *properly* the Son of God, perhaps he will tell us, that he doth not deny it, because he hath told us, that one divine person covenanted to be the Father of Christ, meaning thereby *his human nature only*: and should he be charged, on the contrary, with making the Son of God, a *mere man*, he will deny that also; because he asserts that another divine person covenanted to become a Son, meaning thereby *a Son only in name and by office*, not really, and *properly* so: thus by using the term *Son* as a name of *ambiguous* signification, sometimes meaning by it the *human nature*, and sometimes a *divine person*; it is hard to say what our author means, and whom he means, when he calls Christ the Son of God: for if it be taken from the covenant engagement of a divine person called the Father, it means *one thing*, but if it be taken the covenant engagement of a *second divine person*, it means *another thing*: now what shall I call this? Is it inconsistency, or shuffling, or sophistry? Let the reader judge—I have not wilfully misrepresented Mr. Romaine's words or meaning; and if I have mistaken him, I hope he will shew me wherein, that I may do him justice, for I desire to justify him: but divine truth is sacred—Now I beg  
leave

leave to ask Mr. Romaine what warrant he hath from scripture to assert that the names of *Father* and *Son*, when applied to God, and his Christ, are *official* characters, or *names of office*; and if they mean so in one text, why not in all? I hope he will be so kind as to produce his vouchers from the sacred books; for altho' he himself hath appealed to them, and exhorted us to try his doctrine by them; yet he hath not mentioned one single text as a proof of his assertion. I, for my part, cannot find that the scripture ever speaks of God, as a Father; or of Christ, as a Son, in any other sense but what is common, and proper; that is to say, that the names are terms of *relation*, and not of *æconomy*; and are intirely grounded on this, that one of the persons, viz. the FATHER, *begat*; and that the other, viz. the Son, was derived, brought forth, or *begotten* by him. See Psal. ii. 7. Prov. viii. 24, 25. Luke i. 35. John i. 14, 18. Rom. i. 3, 4. Col. i. 15, 18. Can it be imagined, that such texts speak of Christ as an *official*, and not as a *real* Son? It may I think with as much shew of reason and truth be affirmed, that God is only the Father of believers by office, and that believers are only the sons of God by office; as that God is the *Father* of Christ by office, and that Christ is the *Son* of God by office. See Heb. i. 5, 6. 2 Cor. vi. 18. Rom. viii. 17, 29, 32.—What satisfaction God demanded, and Christ hath given for the sins of men, I have shewn already\*. *God spared not his own Son*,—for *he hath made him sin for us, who knew no sin*—“ The Almighty had a right to give the Lord Jesus Christ to die for sin, he had a propriety in him, he was his own Son, his begotten

† See Sacred Controversy, p. 38—50.

Son—besides, there was Christ's free consent"—“ The law indeed is not fulfilled by the very persons that broke it”—“ but then it is fulfilled in that very nature—and it is by this, I apprehend, that the law is magnified and made honourable, rather than by the consideration of its being obeyed by him, who is the **LAWGIVER**, or the **DIVINE NATURE**. As to its having an infinite obedience given to it, I must confess to me it is not sense, nor any-ways intelligible †.” But if Christ's *human nature only* felt, and endured the curse, and wrath of God due to us for sin, then the sufferings and satisfaction cannot be said to be absolutely infinite, *because the human nature was not so*; therefore its being united to, and supported by an infinite divine person, did not make the sufferings of the inferior human nature strictly speaking infinite, though they were a full recompence for our numerous and aggravated offences.

ARG. 12. “ The doctrine of the Trinity is the most necessary article of the christian religion, and we cannot take one safe step in the way to heaven, without being clear in it.” p. 17.

ANS. 12. If every necessary article of the christian religion be contained in the holy scriptures, it is then certain that Mr. Romaine's doctrine of the Trinity is so far from being necessary, that it is no article of it at all: and if we cannot take one safe step in the way to heaven without being clear in it, that is, without being clear in Mr. Romaine's scheme of the Trinity; then I may safely affirm that no man ever yet took one safe step in the way

† Gospel Magazine for September 1772. p. 434, 436.



to heaven, Mr. Romaine himself not excepted—for it is manifest that he is not clear in his own scheme, because it is full of inconsistencies, and by no means doth it agree with the sacred books : from whence also it appears, that he hath not yet rightly understood the scripture doctrine of the covenant, nor is he clear in the person of the Mediator.

ARG. 13. “ Our blessed Lord was Jehovah when he covenanted to be made flesh and to become a Son ; and the very nature and terms of the covenant prove, that at the making of it he must have been a person of the self-existent essence, because he had thereby such offices committed to him, as none but the true God was able to sustain.” p. 18.

ANS. 13. Mr. Romaine takes that for granted, which yet remains to be proved, for he hath not made it appear from scripture that Christ is ever called Jehovah, or that he ever covenanted to become a Son : and what the terms of the covenant were, Mr. Romaine hath not been able to shew ; and as to the offices committed to Christ, viz. that of a *prophet*, *priest*, and *king* ; they are so far from proving Christ to be the true God, that they prove directly the contrary : for the scripture plainly declares and testifies, that *Jehovah*, the true God, *appointed him to all these offices, and put his Spirit upon him*, that he might be able to execute and discharge them fully, and faithfully. See Ps. cx. throughout, Isa. xi. 1, 2, 3. ch. xlii. 1—6. Luke iv. 18. Heb. vii. 21—28. Matt. xxviii. 18. But if Mr. Romaine can prove from scripture, that Christ *set up himself*, or *supported himself* ; and that he was not chosen, and

strengthened in the execution of his offices by another person ; I will then yield him the whole of the argument : but if God the Father chose, and appointed Christ, to be the Saviour of his people, and promised to support him, and did actually strengthen him, throughout the whole work of his mediatorial undertaking ; how can his having such offices committed to him, be any proof of his *personal* deity ? There is neither reason, nor truth in Mr. Romaine's assertion ;—not reason, because Christ did not support himself,—not truth, because the scripture testifies that he was anointed, and upheld by God the Father, who both chose him, put his Spirit upon him, and sent him to be the Saviour of the world —Could Mr. Romaine indeed prove from scripture that the person who came from heaven to die for sinners, viz. Jesus Christ, came of himself, and to do *his own will* :—that he also *upheld himself*, and *was not sustained by any other* ; then, and only then, would his doctrine of Christ's *self existence* be consistent with reason, and truth : for right reason, and revelation will both concur in this, and constantly declare, that the true God doth all things of himself, and works all things of his own sovereign will ; and is SELF-SUFFICIENT, as well as SELF-EXISTENT : and that he never received the least aid, power, command, or authority, from any other person or Being, *under any condition, or relation whatsoever*. And whereas the scriptures declare that Christ received all things from the Father, and that he did not, nor could do any thing of himself ; and Mr. Romaine, on the contrary, affirms that Christ is self-existent, and could, and did do every thing of himself : I therefore infer that Mr. Romaine's doctrine is neither scriptural, nor rational.

ARG. 14. "Let no person think that this is a speculative point. It is not an indifferent thing, whether you receive it or not, for your eternal state depends upon it : you must receive it, or perish for ever ; for whosoever disbelieves it, shall be damned." p. 20.

ANS. 14. That *your* doctrine of the Trinity, is a *speculative point*, is most manifest, for it is not so much as once mentioned, throughout the whole volume of *divine revelation* : But that it is not an *indifferent thing*, I readily own, for whoever receives it, most certainly departs from the simplicity, and truth of the sacred scriptures. How greatly are you mistaken ! that you think your doctrine to be of God, I doubt not ; else you would never have affirmed, that "whosoever disbelieves it shall be damned." This sentence of yours brings to my remembrance the words of our Lord, "they shall put you out of the synagogues, yea the time cometh that whosoever killeth you will think that he doth God service ;" but what follows ? "These things will they do unto you, because they have not known the FATHER nor *me* : " and this I take to be the ground of my friend's error ; *had he known the SON, he would have known the FATHER also*.—But if what you here assert be true, what will become of the multitude of your hearers ? for I may venture to challenge any one of them, and even Mr. Romaine himself to prove, from the scriptures, that *his* doctrine is of God.—This, my dear Sir, is a most serious and weighty matter : dare we sport with the damnation of men ? or dare we take upon us to pronounce men saved, or damned just as they happen to agree or disagree with our particular notions ; when God *the judge*  
of



*of all* hath given us no authority or warrant for it ? for my part, I frankly own, that I do not believe a word of your doctrine, either concerning the covenant, or the Trinity ; and yet we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, we shall be saved, even as the godly trinitarians, *who believe from the heart that Jesus is the Son of God :* but I dare not say, nor will I imagine, that every one who doth not believe *exactly* as I do, shall certainly be damned : but this I firmly believe, that whosoever doth not believe the truth of our Lord's words, when he said, " if ye believe not that I am *he*, ye shall die in your sins," shall certainly be damned. Mr. Romaine indeed hath asserted that Christ, by these words, declared himself to be JEHOVAH : but I believe otherwise, and that He thereby only declared himself to be the promised *Christ*, " the *Son of GOD*, who should come into the world," John xi. 27. Mr. Romaine *seems* to deny this, but I hope at the bottom he doth not *really* deny it. Have I not reason for this hope concerning him ? for he even boggles at his own exposition ; and, in my opinion, hath himself overthrown it : for he interprets our Lord's words as meaning no more, than if he had said, " Jehovah is *in* me of a truth." The man indeed that builds again the error which he had destroyed, makes himself a transgressor : but he who restores the truth which he had taken away, doth that which is lawful and right, and shall find mercy. Now it is one thing to believe Jesus to be Jehovah, the living God ; and another to believe him to be the *Christ of JEHOVAH*, and the *Son of the LIVING GOD* : both he cannot be ; for HE that is JEHOVAH, cannot be JEHOVAH's *Christ* : and HE that is the LIVING GOD cannot

cannot be *his* Son. Christ therefore is so far from being honoured by those who say he is *personally* JEHOVAH, the TRUE GOD; that his very being, and existence both as to his *true person*, and *office* is intirely denied by them. Can Christ, say some, be too much honoured? I answer, no: neither men, nor angels can sufficiently honour him for his love to the Father, and love to the church: nor can they fully declare to what height of glory, and honour God the Father hath exalted him: but when Christ is asserted to be Jehovah himself, he is then denied to be what he really and properly is, viz. the *true* Son, and the *true* Christ of the one LIVING and TRUE God. This also is a sufficient reply to that weak argument which some persons make use of, whose wavering minds seem to be unsettled about the matter; “if Christ, say they, should not be the true God, yet they who confess him to be so, give him all the honour that he receives from others, who maintain that he is *truly*, and *only*, the Son of GOD;” whereas in fact those persons honour him not at all: for we must of necessity either deny him to be the living and true God, or else deny him to be the *Christ* and Son of God: both he cannot be, for Christ is a person, whom God hath anointed, and his Son is a person whom HE hath begotten: the Son therefore is not that DIVINE BEING who both begat him, and anointed him. Besides, the honour given to any Being whatever, if proper and personal, must terminate in his own person: but if we ascribe to Christ, who is a person *anointed* of God, *that honour*, which is *peculiar* and only proper to *that* GOD, who anointed him; it is then clear that we honour not Christ at all, *as Christ*; whatever may be pretended to the contrary: but

if we honour Jesus, as the Christ, it is then certain that we honour the Father also who sent him: for Christ himself hath testified, "He that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me." Thus if I would honour the *ambassador* of an earthly king, I must not honour him as the *very* king himself, whom he represents, and by whose authority he acts; for then I should both deny the person sent to be the king's *true* ambassador, and should likewise deny him that sent him to be the *true* king: but if I receive and honour his ambassador, as such, then I likewise honour the king that sent him; whose person he represents, and in whose name, and by whose authority, he speaks, and acts. Thus Christ declares himself to be his Father's ambassador: "I came forth from God, neither came I of myself, but he *sent* me."—"I came *not* to do my *own will*, but the will of him that *sent* me." "The Father who *sent* me, he gave me a commandment what I should say, and what I should speak. "He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father who hath *sent* him."—They have believed that thou didst *send* me." Therefore to his disciples he said, "Ye believe in God; believe also in me;" that is, as his Son, whom he hath *sent*, which is plain from the words following; and the disciples did so. Therefore it is necessary to salvation that we believe on Jesus, *as the Son*, and *sent* of God; and in this sense the *apostle* testifies, "he is Antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son: whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father," 1 John ii. 22, 23. It matters not whatever else any one may *imagine*, or believe concerning Jesus; for if he believe not on him, as the true Christ, and the true Son of the living God; his faith is vain: and all feelings



feelings and frames, or what is commonly called experience, which is not built upon this truth, and doth not flow from this faith in Jesus, as the Christ and Son of God, is mere fancy and delusion; and will be found so in the end: “for who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the *Son* of God?” 1 John v. 5. wherefore let all men “know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, who was crucified, both Lord and Christ.” This is that glorious truth which the saints above confess, and wherein they exceedingly rejoice, when with one heart, and one mouth, they exult, and cry aloud, “Salvation to our God, who sitteth upon the throne, and unto the LAMB,” Rev. vii. 10.

ARG. 15. “If you can but desire conviction, ye shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God.” p. 8.

ANS. 15. I solemnly declare that I have diligently searched the scriptures, and desired with my whole soul to know, if your doctrine be of God: and I am sure that my mind hath not been blinded with prejudice, nor biased by interest; for I have long wished, and earnestly prayed, that, if it were possible, I might both think and speak as my trinitarian brethren do; but the more I searched the scriptures for that purpose, and prayed to have a right judgment therein; the more clearly I saw, and the more abundantly am I convinced that both the *Albanasian*, and *Hutchinsonian* doctrine of the trinity, is contrary to the divine word.

IF then what you here assert be true, I can witness for one, and am persuaded many more can do the same; that the experiment hath been fairly made, and that your doctrine, *in this particular*, is not of God. But if Mr. Romaine thinks that I have not *sincerely* desired conviction, or that there is some bar in my way, which I do not wish to have removed, I beg that he will tell me what it is, and endeavour to remove it for me; for I myself can find none, nor am I conscious of any. If I sought after popularity, worldly ease, riches, or honour, I would turn trinitarian immediately: but I thank Christ Jesus, my Lord, for that, in some measure, he hath delivered me from the power of these vanities, and hath determined my inmost soul to seek that honour which cometh from God only, and to please him in all things: whose favour is better to me, far better, than life itself—"If I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ."—But after all, the error perhaps may be on your side; and that it is so, hath I think been fully demonstrated from the scriptures. Permit me then to beg of you for once, to suppose it possible, that you yourself may be mistaken—endeavour to divest yourself of prejudice, weigh the matter calmly: it is a point of the greatest moment, the good of the church, the honour of Christ, the glory of God, are nearly concerned in it. Let me intreat you therefore to re-consider your doctrine; try it, examine it thoroughly, by the sacred books: if you do this, and desire conviction, from the light and authority of the inspired writings, perhaps you will begin to doubt of the divinity of your own system, and be led to think more favourably of ours: and it is not impossible but at last you may be obliged to acknowledge,

knowledge, that if the scriptures be divine, *our doctrine* is certainly of God. You will not, I hope, consider this letter, though sent you from the press, as the effect of envy or hatred, for I assure you it is not; nor reckon my *manner* of writing, in any part of it, as unchristianly severe, and uncharitable: I have only endeavoured to suit the remedy to the disease. I had also in my thoughts the words of Solomon, who says, “ Rebuke a wise man and he will love thee :” and again he assures us, “ He that reproveth his neighbour shall afterwards find more favour, than he that flattereth with his lips.” And thus Paul found it when he sharply reproveth his brother apostle; for Peter did not afterwards speak so highly and affectionately of Barnabas, who dissembled with him, as of his brother Paul who had reproveth him. How happy shall I be if my brother Romaine should herein imitate that great apostle Peter: but if he yet suppose the error to be on our side, I hope he will take as much pains to convince me of it, as I have done to convince him. I think also, that few persons are more *desirous* than myself of exercising forbearance, and of promoting peace, and love among christians; but the truth will always be opposed by them that countenance error: and from such persons who hate the light, and resist the truth, proceeds all the *hurtful* strife, and bitter contention that is in the world about religion; and this our Lord himself hath plainly declared would be the effect of his gospel being published in the world: “ Think not, saith he, that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword.” But those who sincerely receive Christ, and his gospel into their hearts by faith, even by that faith which worketh by



love, cannot designedly either oppose the truth, or break the bond of christian peace : and this divine grace of undissembled, disinterested, pure love among all saints, for Christ's sake, and the gospel's ; I wish to see it revive and abound among all the churches of the saints : and *then* they would receive one another as Christ received them, to the glory of God. For my own part, I can readily communicate, and live and die, and go to heaven with a *christian trinitarian*, as well as a unitarian : *there* we shall be all of one mind, if not before.—“ God is love ; and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him.” *Love to the brethren* is the chief, and best evidence that any man can have, or give, of his being a *real* christian ; and I reckon every one for a christian brother who believes, and confesses that Jesus is the Son of God, and that walks after his commandments. Should he conceive of Christ, as a person begotten of the divine essence, or should he think otherwise of that matter, I would not therefore reject him, *we know but in part* ; our mistakes will all be rectified by-and-by : it is enough for me that he owns Jesus to be the Son of God, and comes to God by him, and is a humble and peaceable follower of the Lamb. That you, my dear Sir, may be enriched with this grace, of divine love, flowing from a living faith in the Son of God, and with every other grace of the Spirit, is, the sincere desire, and prayer of

Your real friend and servant in the Lord,

R. ELLIOT.

P O S T.

---



---

## P O S T S C R I P T.

THE Hutchinsonians are generally reckoned a *new* sort of trinitarians, *lately sprung up*, and diverse from all that were before them. They assert, if I rightly understand them, (for most errors affect obscurity) that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are *three, co-ordinate, self-existent, and independent* divine persons, that is to say, they are *three* distinct, absolute, *supreme gods*. That their doctrine is *polytheism*, and was esteemed such by the antients, is asserted by the ablest writers in defence of the Athanasian Trinity, some of which I have quoted in a former work on this subject †. What induced the Hutchinsonians to reject the commonly received opinion, and to invent to themselves a new one, seems to be this: they plainly saw that the true God must be self-existent, and therefore they could no longer maintain the personal deity of Christ, as a divine person, *properly begotten*: for

† See Divine Revelation, &c. p. 9—13.

to say the most of him in that view, he can only be considered as a second begotten God, inferior to him that begat him: for if he was begotten of the Father's substance, yet he would not therefore be *co-equal* with him: but as the Nicene creed expresses it, he would then be "God of God, very God of very God, begotten, not made:" that is, in plain terms, a second God, begotten of the supreme God. The Hutchinsonsians therefore have invented a new scheme, which, had it been founded in truth, would have incontestably proved that the Son was himself the true God, and not only *co-essential*, but also *co-equal* with the Father: whereas the most that can be said of the Athanasian doctrine is, that it proves the Son only to be *co-essential*, but not *co-equal*. Now as the Hutchinsonsians could not, with any colour of truth, impose their *imaginary* hypothesis upon the christian world, without pretending to have scripture-warrant and authority for it; therefore they tell us that ALEIM \*, the Hebrew word for God, means three divine persons in covenant: they likewise, with strange inconsistency, assert, that the divine person, who spake by the prophets, saying, "I, even I am JEHOVAH, and besides me there is no Saviour:" "a just God and a Saviour, there is none besides me," &c. &c. is Jesus Christ. But it happens, very unfavourable to their scheme, that not only the prophets constantly speak of Jehovah the ALEIM of Israel, as of one single person, but the apostles also have declared it in the most plain terms; and have likewise testified, that Jehovah the God of Israel, who spake by the prophets, is the

\* See Divine Revelation, p. 175—190.

Father:



Father : so that the Hutchinsonian doctrine makes the Son to be the Father : it is no wonder then, that they deny Christ to be the true Son of God, for certainly the Father is not the Son.—Is not then the *modern* Hutchinsonian *hypothesis*, a composition of *Sabellianism*, and *tritheism* ?

2. EVERY objection of the trinitarians is, I think, plainly answered and refuted by these few scriptures : see John iv. 23, 24. ch. xvii. 3. ch. xx. 31. Mark xii. 29. ch. xiii. 32. Acts i. 7. Luke ix. 26. 1 Thess. i. 9, 10. Heb. i. 1, 2, 3. 1 Cor. iii. 23. ch. viii. 5, 6. ch. xi. 3. ch. xv. 24—28. These texts do most plainly declare and fully testify, that the Father *personally*, and *alone*, is the *one* TRUE GOD.—How absurd must it be to suppose the Father alone to be *opposed to idols*, if there were any other person *equally God* with him ? or to suppose that He alone knew all things, if there were any other person *equally omniscient* with him ? The false gloss which some put on Mark xiii. 32. viz. that the Son knew not the day of judgment, *as mediator*, or in one nature, when he knew it in another nature, cannot be so much as pretended of the Holy Spirit, and yet he is not once mentioned in the text. Is not then the *Arian*, as well as the *Hutchinsonian* doctrine plainly unscriptural ? But in what sense Christ the WORD is called God, I have already shewn at large †. Also how and in what respect Christ is worshipped according to the scripture, hath been fully declared §. The apostle John did not write his gospel, as some have sup-

† Sac. Controversy, p. 16—26.

§ Sac. Controversy, 29—37.

posed, in order to prove that Jesus was the true God, but quite the contrary ; for he wrote it to prove that Jesus was the Christ the Son of God, as himself expressly testifies, ch. xx. 31. and consequently all the scriptures must unanimously declare, and testify the same thing. Do not the inspired writers with one consent assert and maintain, that the *true God demanded* satisfaction for our sins, and that his true Son *gave* that satisfaction—God did not *make* satisfaction, but receive it : Christ his anointed Son did not *receive* satisfaction, but *make* it. God gave his own Son for us, and then the Son gave himself.—Christ was sent of God, came from God, and went to God—God anointed Christ, God was with Christ, God was in Christ—The TRUE GOD is the Father of Christ, the God of Christ, the head of Christ—Christ is in God, Christ is God's own Son, Christ is God's—The true Christ is at the right hand of God, Christ is made a prince and a Saviour, Christ hath all power given unto him both in heaven and earth, Christ is made a quickening Spirit—Christ is our advocate with the Father, who ever liveth to make intercession for us. Thus “ Christ is made of God unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.” These things, and much more to the same purpose, are expressly declared, and testified by the holy prophets, and apostles throughout the scripture, concerning the living God, and concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord. Should then any one yet deny this divine testimony, so plain, and so full ; to argue any longer with him would, I think, be in vain : therefore I shall only add, “ Let God be true, and every man a liar.”

12 MR 58  
F I N I S.

R. E.

